

*The* JOURNAL of  
SOUTHERN  
HISTORY

---

VOL. XII

AUGUST, 1946

No. 3

---



*Published quarterly by the*  
SOUTHERN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

# *The Journal of Southern History*

VOLUME XII

AUGUST, 1946

NUMBER 3

*Published Quarterly by*  
THE SOUTHERN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION



## BOARD OF EDITORS

WESLEY F. CRAVEN  
New York University

RUDOLPH L. BIESELE  
University of Texas

THOMAS D. CLARK  
University of Kentucky

WILLIAM B. HAMILTON  
Duke University

WENDELL H. STEPHENSON  
University of Kentucky

BERNARD MAYO  
University of Virginia

KATHRYN ABBEY HANNA  
Rollins College

HENRY T. SHANKS  
Birmingham-Southern College

## MANAGING EDITOR

WILLIAM C. BINKLEY, Vanderbilt University

## EDITORIAL ASSOCIATE

HENRY L. SWINT, Vanderbilt University

## GUARANTOR

VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY



Correspondence in regard to contributions to the *Journal* should be sent to the Managing Editor, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee.

The Southern Historical Association supplies the *Journal* to its members. The annual membership fee is three dollars; upon payment of fifty dollars, any person may become a life member. Single numbers of the *Journal* are available at seventy-five cents. Membership application and checks should be sent to James W. Patton, Secretary-Treasurer, North Carolina State College, Raleigh, North Carolina.

The Southern Historical Association disclaims responsibility for statements made by contributors.

Entered as second-class matter April 5, 1935, at the Post Office at University Station, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, under the Act of August 24, 1912. Additional entry at Nashville, Tennessee.

# *The Journal of Southern History*

VOLUME XII

AUGUST, 1946

NUMBER 3



Copyright, 1946, by the Southern Historical Association

## CONTENTS

<i>William Garrott Brown: Literary Historian and Essayist.</i> By Wendell H. Stephenson .....	313
<i>Robert Wormeley Carter of Sabine Hall: Notes on the Life of a Virginia Planter.</i> By Louis Morton .....	345
<i>The Establishment of the Alabama Railroad Commission.</i> By Allen J. Going .....	366
<i>The Southern Industrial Gospel before 1860.</i> By Herbert Collins .....	386
 <i>Notes and Documents</i>	
The Fight to Depose Governor Francis Nicholson—James Blair's Affidavit of June 7, 1704. Edited by Samuel C. McCulloch .....	403
A Postscript on Thomas Jefferson and His University Professors. Edited by Richard Beale Davis .....	422
 <i>Book Reviews</i>	
Gipson, <i>The British Empire before the American Revolution</i> , Volume VI, by Hugh T. Lefler .....	433
Hornberger, <i>Scientific Thought in the American Colleges, 1638-1800</i> , by Thomas Cary Johnson .....	434
Clark, <i>A Description of Kentucky in North America</i> , by Robert S. Cotterill ..	436
Davis, <i>Correspondence of Thomas Jefferson and Francis Walker Gilmer, 1814-1826</i> , by Lester J. Cappon .....	437
Dodd, <i>Florida Becomes a State</i> , by Sidney Walter Martin .....	438
Bill, <i>The Beleaguered City: Richmond, 1861-1865</i> , by H. J. Eckenrode .....	439
Randall, <i>Lincoln and the South</i> , by David M. Potter .....	441
Schmitt, <i>General George Crook: His Autobiography</i> , by Carl Coke Rister .....	442
Anderson, <i>The Centennial Edition of the Works of Sidney Lanier</i> , Volumes I to X, by Richmond Croom Beatty .....	443
Daniels, <i>The Wilson Era: Years of War and After, 1917-1923</i> , by George C. Osborn .....	445
Vance, <i>All These People: The Nation's Human Resources in the South</i> , by T. Lynn Smith .....	447
 <i>Historical News and Notices</i>	
The Annual Meeting .....	449
Personal .....	450
Bibliographical .....	454
<i>Contributors</i> .....	466

# William Garrott Brown: Literary Historian and Essayist

BY WENDELL H. STEPHENSON

In the early years of the twentieth century, William Garrott Brown acquired an enviable reputation as a literary historian, philosophical essayist, and political paragrapher.<sup>1</sup> Publishing houses and literary magazines competed for the provender from his prolific pen. Men of letters and professional historians commended his articles and books in superlative language, and practical politicians heeded his pungent paragraphs on contemporary issues. William R. Thayer thought he "possessed ampler gifts for producing history of the highest rank than anyone who has come out of Harvard during the past 25 years—may I not say that he was easily first of the younger men from anywhere in America?" This appraisal was penned three years after Brown's death, but Thayer had already lauded his young protégé. "You have a real gift of story-telling," he wrote after reading *Andrew Jackson*; and again, "That was a graceful article you wrote in the *Historical Review* on Rhodes."<sup>2</sup> Albert B. Hart asserted that Brown was "one of the few men in the country who has both got something to say and can say it."

<sup>1</sup> The material for this study was assembled during the winter of 1944-1945 while the writer was traveling on a research grant from the General Education Board, to whom thanks are gratefully acknowledged.

<sup>2</sup> William R. Thayer to John S. Bassett, December 14, 1916; Thayer to William G. Brown, November 27, 1900, November 12, 1905, in William Garrott Brown Papers (Manuscript Department, Duke University Library, Durham, N. C.). The papers in this collection were assembled by Bassett, 1916-1917, with the intention of writing a biography of Brown. He contributed a brief article, "My Recollections of William Garrott Brown," to the *South Atlantic Quarterly* (Durham, 1902- ), XVI (1917), 97-107. After Bassett's death in 1928, Mrs. Bassett presented the papers to the Duke University Library through the courtesy of William K. Boyd.

After listening to a paper he read at a meeting of the American Historical Association, Hart was envious of his "power of language and statement! Everywhere I hear the same story—that W. G. Brown is one of the few men in the country who can actually write history."<sup>3</sup> Quoting Charles F. Adams to the effect that "learning, judgment, and the literary sense" were historical prerequisites, Jeremiah Smith thought Brown's writing happily combined all of them. "Your 'sense of proportion' seems to me perfect."<sup>4</sup> Soon after his election to the speakership, Champ Clark told a dinner group: "The best piece of political biography of the past twenty years is a book on Stephen A. Douglas by William Garrott Brown."<sup>5</sup> Brown's power of expression impressed J. Franklin Jameson, chairman of the committee to arrange the American Historical Association's program for 1904, who wrote that "the attractive form which you know so well how to give to a brief paper would be as welcome as it is unusual in our proceedings."<sup>6</sup> Andrew C. McLaughlin, managing editor of the Association's *Review*, wrote Brown regarding an article on Oliver Ellsworth: "you have very skillfully woven your facts together and given to the dry details gathered from the journals a living interest, all this coming from the alchemy of a writer with literary instinct and power."<sup>7</sup>

What was the background of the man who impressed his contemporaries so favorably?<sup>8</sup> His life spanned the brief period from 1868 to

<sup>3</sup> Albert B. Hart to Brown, September 28, 1903; January 2, 1906, in Brown Papers.

<sup>4</sup> Jeremiah Smith to Brown, December 4, 1900, *ibid.* Smith was writing of Brown's *Andrew Jackson*.

<sup>5</sup> Edward G. Lowry to Francis G. Caffey, April 7, 1911, in Brown Papers. Lowry was the Washington correspondent of the New York *Evening Post*.

<sup>6</sup> J. Franklin Jameson to Brown, October 7, 1904, in Brown Papers.

<sup>7</sup> Andrew C. McLaughlin to Brown, April 12, 1905, in American Historical Association Papers, Review Correspondence, 1905 (Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress, Washington, D. C.).

<sup>8</sup> For sketches of Brown's career, see Francis G. Caffey, "William Garrott Brown," in Allen Johnson and Dumas Malone (eds.), *Dictionary of American Biography*, 20 vols. and index (New York, 1928-1937), III, 158-59; Edward S. Martin, "William Garrott Brown," in *Harvard Graduates' Magazine* (Boston, 1892-1934), XXII (1913-1914), 255-57; Thomas M. Owen, *History of Alabama and Dictionary of Alabama Biography*, 4 vols. (Chicago, 1921), III, 237; Bliss Perry, "Tribute to William Garrott Brown, '91," in *Harvard Alumni Bulletin* (Boston, 1898- ), XVI (1913-1914), 88-89; Bassett, "My Recollections of William Garrott Brown," *loc. cit.*, 97-107.

1913. Born in Marion, Alabama, with Virginia, North Carolina, and Connecticut ancestry, he was educated at various preparatory schools in his native town, and attended Howard College, 1883-1886. Excelling in scholarship as well as in activities of the Philomathic Society, he graduated with honor, devoted a year to independent study and writing for the *Montgomery Advertiser*, and taught English for a bien-nium at the Marion Military Institute. Brown contemplated graduate study at the Johns Hopkins University, but correspondence with a former schoolmate at Howard College, Francis G. Caffey, resulted in both of them entering Harvard University as juniors in the fall of 1889. Brown graduated in 1891, *summa cum laude*.<sup>9</sup> Awarded the Ozias Goodwin Fellowship, he continued at Harvard during the following year to work for the master's degree in history. The teacher who impressed him most favorably was Charles E. Norton,<sup>10</sup> whose course on Roman and Mediaeval Art gave him a permanent interest in the subject and prompted a visit to Italy some years later.<sup>11</sup> In the department of history he studied Western Europe from the Germanic Invasions to the Treaty of Verdun with George Bendelari, the Reformation with Ephraim Emerton, and he enrolled in Edward Channing's Seminary in American History.<sup>12</sup> His research problem was "The Genesis of the Southern Confederacy," and on this topic, Brown wrote a few years later, "I had the nerve to deliver several lectures when I visited my old home in Alabama, in the winter of 1892-93. Some of my audiences were sprinkled with ex-Confederates, but I escaped with no bones broken."<sup>13</sup>

In 1892 Brown was placed in charge of the University Archives, and four years later he was made Deputy Keeper of University Records.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>9</sup> His diploma is preserved in the Brown Papers. He was appointed to the Gambrell Scholarship during his senior year, took "Highest Honors" in history, was elected to Phi Beta Kappa, and gave one of nine commencement orations. *Harvard College, Class of 1891, Secretary's Report, No. 1* (Cambridge, 1892), 28, 34, 36, 56.

<sup>10</sup> Brown to Thayer, March 14, 1900, in William Roscoe Thayer Manuscripts (Houghton Reading Room, Harvard College Library, Cambridge, Mass.).

<sup>11</sup> For Brown's trips to Europe, see Brown to Thayer, May 29, 1906; March 1, 1907, *ibid.*; and January 10, 31, 1913, in Brown Papers.

<sup>12</sup> *The Harvard University Catalogue, 1891-92* (Cambridge, 1891), 82, 84, 85, 227.

<sup>13</sup> *Harvard College, Class of 1891, Secretary's Report, No. 2* (Boston, 1895), 13.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*; *Harvard College, Class of 1891, Secretary's Report, No. 3* (Boston, 1899),

In both of these positions his work was supervised by the librarian, Justin Winsor, whose learning the young scholar deeply appreciated. Under Winsor's direction he prepared *A List of Portraits in the Various Buildings of Harvard University* (1898). The director of the project died before it was completed, and Brown wrote: "How much better it might have been if he had lived can be conjectured by those who knew his tirelessness and his marvelous familiarity with the minute details of the lives of many men. I once asked him a question about a New England family of no national importance, and his reply was a hasty pencil sketch of a family tree, showing the births and marriages of a century; it was the work of a minute, without a glance at any source of information."<sup>15</sup>

It is quite likely that Brown's ambition was a career in politics, but for a time at least he hoped for an academic connection. Increasing deafness prevented either from materializing, although he was appointed lecturer at Harvard for the year 1901-1902, and gave a course on the political and constitutional history of the United States since the Civil War.<sup>16</sup> Perhaps it was Brown's political ambition that led him to study history; at least that was the conjecture of Charles M. Thompson, intimate friend and the editor of *Youth's Companion*, to which Brown was a frequent contributor. "The men he admired were the early statesmen," Thompson wrote; "the great subject he was interested in was the future of the South"; the career he preferred was "national politics. I think he had all the Southerner's traditional liking for them and that he studied history primarily to make himself competent in political ways."<sup>17</sup>

Whatever the reason for taking up history, Brown had his own concept of how it should be written. He was one of the first to protest

9; *The Harvard University Catalogue*, 1893-94 (Cambridge, 1893), 48; *ibid.*, 1896-97 (Cambridge, 1896), 50; *ibid.*, 1899-1900 (Cambridge, 1900), 15.

<sup>15</sup> William G. Brown, *A List of Portraits in the Various Buildings of Harvard University*, prepared under the direction of the late Justin Winsor, Librarian, in William C. Lane (ed.), *Library of Harvard University, Bibliographical Contributions*, No. 53 (Cambridge, 1898), 4.

<sup>16</sup> *The Harvard University Catalogue*, 1901-02 (Cambridge, 1901), 18, 365.

<sup>17</sup> Charles M. Thompson to Bassett, June 12, 1917, in Brown Papers.



against the monographic, dry-as-dust product that emanated from historical seminars. When a new professorship was established at Harvard in 1900, he saw an opportunity for a radical departure from the current method of teaching and writing. Professors in American universities, as in Germany, had reduced method and motive to a science, eliminating imagination, sympathy, and conjecture. The "human element" had been subordinated to institutions, customs, and laws; indeed, "men are important chiefly as affecting these, not these as affecting and revealing men." With emphasis upon facts that admitted of definite proof, professors frowned upon "a sympathetic and imaginative treatment." The monographic method did not permit the painting of pictures; but there could be no "living republic" until passions, ideals, and instincts clothed the framework of the nation's development.<sup>18</sup>

Some of the requirements set down by Brown, though by no means all, were considered by him to have been met by Woodrow Wilson in his *History of the American People* (1902). Wilson was, according to Brown, a brilliant writer. With "the quickest and keenest mind now at play on our American past," he considered "scholarship as a means, not as an end," and looked upon "history as a branch of literature rather than of science." He had successfully resisted the dominance of the document when German influence invaded the United States, and European and American universities were attempting "'to develop learning at the expense of writing,' and to elevate history by subduing the historian." Free of partisanship, spacious in conception, intelligent in presentation, there was nothing "profoundly philosophical and sagacious" about his recent work, nor did it "stir, absorb, elevate, depress." A truly great work is the devotion of a lifetime; Wilson's fell far short of the standard set by John R. Green and Francis Parkman.

Comparing Wilson and John Fiske, whose *Essays, Historical and Literary* (1903) had just appeared, Brown thought that Fiske had succeeded better, if one considered all his works, than had the President

<sup>18</sup> William G. Brown, "An Opportunity," in *Harvard Graduates' Magazine*, VIII (1899-1900), 490-94. See also, Brown to Thayer, March 9, 14, May 17, 1900, in Thayer Manuscripts; Smith to Bassett, December 28, 1916, in Brown Papers. Brown alluded to the Dorman B. Eaton professorship to which A. Lawrence Lowell was appointed.

of Princeton. Analyzed in detail, Wilson's writing was more felicitous and impressive. "That is why we call it brilliant. It shines." But it failed to "hold the reader," for "The continuous flow of skillful sentences actually tends to draw one's attention from the matter in them. They sometimes come between the reader and the story which they tell; and, after all, it is the story, not the English, which one means to read." With Fiske there was no artifice, no affectation—"The style is as unmistakable as his voice or his handwriting."<sup>19</sup>

Two years later Brown reviewed for the *American Historical Review* the fifth volume of James F. Rhodes' *History of the United States from the Compromise of 1850* (1904). His critique was in reality an appraisal of the first five volumes. They impressed the reviewer favorably. Together they constituted "the best history of the Civil War." He would go further: the project was "clearly entitled to the first place among the various enterprises in historiography now in progress in this country." And, with the passing of Green, William Stubbs, Edward A. Freeman, and Mandell Creighton, there was now no one in England whose work could compare with it. Rhodes assembled all the evidence, provided ample citations to prove his statements, and arrived at the truth. He avoided the "constant temptation to overstate and overcolor," a restraint that demanded firm resolution. As to style, he "is never brilliant"; his "prose is not imaginative. Fancy, grace, tenderness are wanting. . . . The pace is slow, and it never changes." Despite these criticisms, he continued, the work is, "after all, decidedly

<sup>19</sup> William G. Brown, "The Problem of the American Historian," in *Atlantic Monthly* (Boston, 1857- ), XCII (1903), 649-61. In addition to the works by Woodrow Wilson and John Fiske, this article also considered briefly *The Cambridge Modern History*, VII, *The United States* (New York, 1903). Brown used the three works as a point of departure in expounding his own concept of history.

After reading Brown's article, Frederic Bancroft wrote to Bassett: "His *Atlantic* article has many good touches & also a good deal of vague long-windedness that he & [Bliss] Perry consider style. Dunning & I think just the same of his work: it's very clever & very superficial. If he would only work, meditate silently & ripen! His (I fear fatal) mistake is that he would be judge before he has fully mastered the routine learning to the making of a good lawyer. . . . He's too self-conscious, & because he sees many below him he imagines that he is at the top. That's the amiable weakness of the typical Southerner, especially of 'the old school.'" Bancroft to Bassett, November 9, 1903, in John S. Bassett Papers (in possession of Mrs. Bassett, Northampton, Mass.).

readable. The author's candor and sincerity and thoroughness, his great appetite for truth, his deep, masculine interest in his subject—these things far outweigh his mainly negative infelicities. . . . May he not have been wise to choose for himself the style and manner which he finds most natural, most expressive of his own everyday standards of judgment and taste?" Brown was hopeful that the author would eventually publish a popular work, stripped of scholarly paraphernalia, that would attract readers "whom the very air and method of scholarship affrights."<sup>20</sup> He would, as he wrote Rhodes, plead "that we ought always to keep the untrained reader in mind, since the past is his as well as ours."<sup>21</sup>

Lest it be supposed that Brown was artist and nothing more, it should be emphasized that he recognized truth as the primary aim of historical literature. The historian's "imagination must serve, not control. He must tell what actually happened in former times."<sup>22</sup> Brown was aware that a search for facts was absolutely necessary; this was done at all universities. But history had not attained its goal if it went no further. To vitalize the record, someone must breathe the breath of life into it. With one notable exception in his own writing, Brown was content to draw heavily upon the inquiries of others. His *Life of Oliver Ellsworth* showed considerable delving into the sources; elsewhere his contribution embraced a modicum of research, artistry of expression, proper balance, and a measure of meaningful interpretation. Success as a writer, whether as historian or essayist, stemmed from a lucid, unlabored style, pliantly responsive to the exact pressure of the thought he sought to convey.

The brief period from the turn of the century to 1905 witnessed the

<sup>20</sup> *American Historical Review* (New York, 1895- ), XI (1905-1906), 181-86. For Brown's review of Volumes VI and VII, see *ibid.*, XII (1906-1907), 680-84. He called them "the best history yet written of Reconstruction," but added that this statement must be discounted as very little on that period had been published. William A. Dunning, *Reconstruction, Political and Economic, 1865-1877* (New York, 1907), had not yet appeared.

<sup>21</sup> Brown to James F. Rhodes, March 22, 1905, in Brown Papers. See also, Rhodes to Brown, March 25, October 9, 1905, *ibid.*

<sup>22</sup> Brown, "The Problem of the Historian," *loc. cit.*, 654.

publication of a half dozen books. A school *History of Alabama* appeared in 1900. To Houghton Mifflin and Company's Riverside Biographical Series, Brown contributed two volumes, *Andrew Jackson* (1900) and *Stephen Arnold Douglas* (1902). Then came his greatest work, *The Lower South in American History* (1902), a collection of lectures and essays, some of which had already appeared in a literary magazine. *The Foe of Compromise and Other Essays* was published in 1903. *The Life of Oliver Ellsworth* (1905) was the last of his books, except for a posthumous assemblage of articles, *The New Politics and Other Papers* (1914). He had, however, tried his hand at writing a novel, *A Gentleman of the South; A Memory of the Black Belt* (1903); and he also wrote a play depicting planter politics in the Lower South which did not command a publisher.<sup>23</sup> In the midst of his productive period, irreparable tragedy overtook him, although it was not until 1906 that doctors diagnosed his illness as tuberculosis. He had already projected other historical studies, on some of which he had done considerable work, but declining health prevented a continuation of any of them. He did not lay down his pen, however, until six weeks before his death, for he was a regular contributor to newspapers and periodicals. During the last two and a half years, his writing was done mainly in bed.

Brown's *History of Alabama* was written for school children entering their teens. Because of its elementary nature, it need not concern us here except as it indicates a wholesome balance between sectional background and a spirit of nationalism. As Brown was chronicling the history of his "own people," he "escaped the temptation to set down aught in malice"; he did not think "it right or necessary to abate one jot of reverence for the great captains of a long lost cause." But he wrote "also as an American, ardently attached to my whole country, and determined from the first that no word of mine should ever weaken in any child's mind that devotion to the great Republic which in me is grown into a passion."<sup>24</sup> One of Brown's favorite expressions was,

<sup>23</sup> The manuscript is in the Brown Papers.

<sup>24</sup> William G. Brown, *A History of Alabama, For Use in the Schools, Based as to Its Earlier Parts on the Work of Albert J. Pickett* (New York, 1900), 6.

"The South is my Mother but New England is my Sweet-heart."<sup>25</sup> In this spirit he wrote to John S. Bassett in 1907, soon after the Trinity College professor transferred to Northampton, Massachusetts: "I am interested in the evolution of Johnny Rebeldom by you[r] contact with New England civilization. If you keep on living up there, you will go through many oscillations of the scales, but if, after a while, you are shipped off as I have been, you will find Southern kindness mighty agreeable. But I should be the last to forget how many fine enthusiasms one can catch in New England."<sup>26</sup>

*Andrew Jackson*, a little volume of some twenty thousand words, was the first of the Riverside Biographical Series, and undoubtedly set a proper pattern for succeeding numbers. Written in clear and simple but forceful English, its style has no monographic flavor. It is doubtful if the author consulted many primary sources. With James Parton's *Life of Andrew Jackson* and a few general histories before him, supplemented by knowledge of recent monographs, he could easily have written the book without going to original materials except for verification. In doing what was expected of him, Brown performed with considerable merit. In small compass he wrote in entertaining and and readable manner of the outstanding events of Jackson's career. It is a book of highlights, with facts and illustrations ably selected. In portraying Jackson's character, his points of strength and his weaknesses, Brown is at his best. He balanced positive against negative, virtue against fault, in superior fashion. One puts the book aside with the feeling that he knows Jackson the man intimately. In one respect the author succeeded far better than most biographers and political historians: his political terminology is correct.<sup>27</sup>

In *Stephen Arnold Douglas*, as in *Andrew Jackson*, Brown selected his facts and illustrations carefully and exhibited fairness in dealing with Douglas' contemporaries. He found no such faults in the Illinois

<sup>25</sup> Bertha C. Clement to Bassett, May 6, 1917, in Brown Papers. See also, Miss Clement to Bassett, December 27, 1916, *ibid.* Miss Clement was Brown's nurse for two and a half years.

<sup>26</sup> Brown to Bassett, February 25, 1907, *ibid.*

<sup>27</sup> William G. Brown, *Andrew Jackson* (Boston, 1900).

statesman as he discovered in Jackson; his detachment is revealed, however, in his portrayal of the two great Illinois leaders, "The Rivals."<sup>28</sup> In a chapter on "Leadership," his description of Senate scenes as Douglas defended himself and the Kansas-Nebraska bill by putting his critics on the defensive is superb. Brown had some of the qualities of the successful fight announcer: he saw the dramatic, the wild thrill of enthusiasm as the match warmed into skillful boxing and hard-hitting slugging. There are in this work, as in his life of Jackson, a few minor errors; but never is accuracy sacrificed for dramatic effect.<sup>29</sup>

*Oliver Ellsworth* stands in sharp contrast to Brown's briefer portraits of Jackson and Douglas. It is less readable, yet its duller portions represent craftsmanship of a higher order than the typical monographic study attained. The difficulty was with the subject: the Connecticut jurist was a drab character, and the author had no more than launched the project before he questioned his capacity to produce an interesting narrative.<sup>30</sup> Despite Brown's self-depreciation, critics received it generously. McLaughlin accepted two of the chapters for publication in the *American Historical Review* and complimented the contributor on his literary ability.<sup>31</sup> He also appraised the book for the *Review*, and concluded that Brown had made his subject "a living personality." The "mere advocate of measures . . . [had] become a man and an impressive one."<sup>32</sup> Documentary material was scarce, for Ellsworth wrote few letters and seldom drafted a speech. Brown used to good advantage the Jonathan Trumbull Papers, manuscripts prepared by Oliver Ellsworth, Jr., and biographical sketches written by Joseph Wood and Abner Jackson, who married respectively Ellsworth's daughter and granddaughter. To a large extent he depended upon such printed sources as the writings of his subject's contemporaries, Senate records,

<sup>28</sup> Also published as "Lincoln's Rival," in *Atlantic Monthly*, LXXXIX (1902), 226-36.

<sup>29</sup> William G. Brown, *Stephen Arnold Douglas* (Boston, 1902).

<sup>30</sup> Brown to Thayer, May 23, 1906, in Thayer Manuscripts.

<sup>31</sup> William G. Brown, "The Early Life of Oliver Ellsworth," in *American Historical Review*, X (1904-1905), 534-64; "A Continental Congressman: Oliver Ellsworth, 1777-1783," *ibid.*, 751-81; McLaughlin to Brown, April 12, 1905, in *American Historical Association Papers, Review Correspondence*, 1905.

<sup>32</sup> *American Historical Review*, XI (1905-1906), 691.

and Supreme Court reports, and there are frequent citations to the Continental Congress journals. With few exceptions he spoke definitively only when reliable evidence was available; then he gave bold and vigorous interpretation to the facts he found.<sup>83</sup>

Brown's reputation as a historian of the South rests largely upon his *Lower South in American History*. As one critic put it, "if he had written nothing else, that alone should perpetuate his memory."<sup>84</sup> In evaluating the book, it should be remembered that he was pioneering in a new field, for only a few substantial treatises on any aspect or period of southern history had appeared by the turn of the century. His native Alabama provided disproportionate illustration; yet he demonstrated that, in a general way, he saw the deep South as a whole, though he offered "apology for the thin and fragmentary effect."<sup>85</sup> Like most collections of papers prepared for different purposes, the work lacks unity and design. The first three essays, which give title to the volume, were lectures delivered at Harvard and at several colleges in the South. Three others—"The Orator of Secession [William L. Yancey]," "The Resources of the Confederacy," and "The Ku Klux Movement"—were published originally in the *Atlantic Monthly*.<sup>86</sup> "A New Hero of an Old Type [Richmond P. Hobson]" and "Shifting the White Man's Burden" appeared in public for the first time.

Speaking for Southerners of his day, Brown could "not recognize the picture" of the Cotton Kingdom painted by outsiders, though he esteemed the reasoning of John E. Cairnes and the observations of Frederick L. Olmsted. They and other doctrinaires and travelers had told only a part of the story; the whole truth revealed a less distorted portrait. He could not agree with Cairnes that the institution of slavery was solely responsible for the "'idle and lawless rabble'" of poor whites, "since under freedom they have not changed or disappeared."<sup>87</sup>

<sup>83</sup> William G. Brown, *The Life of Oliver Ellsworth* (New York, 1905).

<sup>84</sup> Caffey, "William Garrett Brown," *loc. cit.*, 159.

<sup>85</sup> William G. Brown, *The Lower South in American History* (New York, 1902), vii.

<sup>86</sup> William G. Brown, "The Orator of Secession: A Study of an Agitator," in *Atlantic Monthly*, LXXXIII (1899), 605-17; "The Ku Klux Movement," *ibid.*, LXXXVII (1901), 634-44; "The Resources of the Confederacy," *ibid.*, LXXXVIII (1901), 827-38.

<sup>87</sup> Brown, *Lower South in American History*, 27-40.

Brown antedated Ulrich B. Phillips by a quarter of a century in stating the fundamental basis of the latter's "Central Theme of Southern History." A generation under freedom, he asserted, had demonstrated "that the real cause of all the trouble was not slavery, but the presence of Africans in the South in large numbers." And, he added, southern leaders of the last two ante-bellum decades "were trying to do just what the leading men of the South are trying to do now, viz.: to discover some way or ways by which a society made up of whites and blacks in almost equal proportions can keep pace with a society made up of whites only."<sup>88</sup>

Commending Alabama's government, Brown insisted that it rested on a broad base, for many self-made men reached political office, and planters did not dominate as much as tradition recorded. While the author cites no authorities, he was probably following Daniel R. Hundley's *Social Relations in Our Southern States* (1860) in finding classes that critical ante-bellum travelers did not see. In Congress representatives of the Lower South stood for "the whole social organism," not just slavery and staple-crop agriculture. Reminiscent of William P. Trent's *William Gilmore Simms* (1892), he spoke of "a primitive industry, a primitive labor system, and a patriarchal mode of life" Southerners struggled to maintain "in the most progressive country in the world." Economically, leaders demanded unrestricted exchange of agricultural staples for foreign commodities and unhampered expansion into new territory; politically, they sought "protection from criticism and from social and humanitarian reforms and changes." To secure these ends, they must assume the offensive—"they must rule."<sup>89</sup> Brown's statement of the challenge they faced merits quotation:

And it was the belated concern of the Northern mind about the things of the spirit, not its absorption in material enterprises, that boded ill to the plantation system. It was the North's moral awakening, and not its industrial alertness, its free thought, and not its free labor, which the Southern planter had to fear. The New England factory made no threat, the town meeting did. The North-western wheat farms and pork packeries and railways were harmless; but Oberlin

<sup>88</sup> *Ibid.*, 94.

<sup>89</sup> *Ibid.*, 34-40, 44, 57-58.



College and Lovejoy's printing press and the underground railway were different. . . . The true danger from without was in the moral and intellectual forces which were at once the cause and the result of the North's progress.<sup>40</sup>

Many of the facts in "The Orator of Secession" were drawn from John W. Du Bose's *The Life and Times of William Lowndes Yancey* (1892); Brown gave them historical life and intelligent interpretation. Overgenerous in assigning the Alabama leader "a place among the half-dozen men who have had most to do with shaping American history" in the nineteenth century, he correctly evaluated his tremendous success in influencing people—an "impassioned invective" that swayed the masses. Foe of compromise in a generation of indecision, single-minded in devotion to the goal of a separate southern confederacy, his oratory appealed to the political and religious assemblages of antebellum years. His mastery of the spoken word was complete: "The sentences sometimes rush like charging cavalry. There are phrases that ring out like bugle calls. It is the language of passionate purpose; of an orator bent on rousing, convincing, overwhelming the men in front of him."<sup>41</sup>

As to the Confederacy's resources, John C. Schwab and Ernest A. Smith had arrayed facts and figures but had left many questions unanswered, for their researches were "set forth too abstrusely, or too cautiously, or too minutely," albeit their unimaginative and restrained findings whetted the intellectual appetite by arousing curiosity. As reasons for the defeat of the Confederacy, Brown cited a defective financial policy, laws that violated sound economy, a retarded industrial development, paucity of practical statesmen, and weakness of the Confederate Congress.<sup>42</sup>

For proper perspective, a statement of the conditions that brought forth its existence, and an appraisal of results obtained, Brown's essay on "The Ku Klux Movement" is a superior piece of work. It is no disparagement of Walter L. Fleming to say that, in treating the Klan, he built upon the excellent foundations laid by Brown, delved deeper

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, 88.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, 117, 124-31, 134, 138, 142, 147-48.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, 158, 185-86.

into the sources, filled in significant details, but left the framework much as he found it. Drawing upon childhood memories of stories heard from "fast friends of the kitchen and the quarters," later conversations with the older generation of whites, written memoranda of participants, the twelve volumes of testimony taken by a congressional investigating committee and its one-volume report, Brown reconstructed the movement in all of its essentials. Enormous as "mismanagement" of state governments was under carpetbag control, he saw greater evils in local communities. He concluded that the movement was successful, implied that, with conditions as they were, it was justifiable, but perceived its continuing ill effects on southern political and social life.<sup>43</sup>

Love for his country had, as Brown put it, "grown into a passion." With the coming of the Spanish-American War, he volunteered his services and even sought the influence of Congressman Joseph Wheeler from his native state in his quest for military duty. But alas, a physical infirmity precluded acceptance, and, in a depressed state of mind, he remained at Harvard to record the exploits of other graduates and to follow with avid interest the fortunes of other Alabamans.<sup>44</sup> His heart swelled with justifiable pride as he read of the heroic deed of young Hobson in sinking the *Merrimac* in Santiago harbor, for Brown had known him as a boy "among the Alabama cotton fields" and on the baseball diamond, and had followed his record at Annapolis. Son of a Confederate father, growing up in an impoverished South, he was of the same type as Lucius Q. C. Lamar and Henry W. Grady, representing that class of Southerners who had faith in the future. But he was "A New Hero of an Old Type"; of the same stock as Decatur and Somers and Cushing. His prototype might be seen in Paul Jones, or even in Walter Raleigh and Francis Drake. Less historical than the other essays in the volume, it illustrated Brown's intense patriotism, and perhaps his remorse that he could not have shared in the glory of war.<sup>45</sup>

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, 192-95, 196-97, 223-25.

<sup>44</sup> Brown to "Dear Frank" (Francis G. Caffey), May 14, 31, August 23, 1898, in Brown Papers; Brown to Thayer, December 21, 1899; February 4, 1900, in Thayer Manuscripts; *Harvard College, Class of 1891, Secretary's Report*, No. 3, p. 9.

<sup>45</sup> Brown, *Lower South in American History*, 229-44.

In "Shifting the White Man's Burden," he revealed an awareness of current political problems in the South: the legal and constitutional disfranchisement of the Negroes since 1890, the effect of Populism upon southern politics, the contests between white and black counties for supremacy, the shifting of influence from the plantation to the industrial South, and conflicting views of southern whites as to a proper solution of the race question. As Brown saw it, "The main thing is not what to do for the negro, but what to do for the white man living among negroes." The accomplishments of Tuskegee and Hampton were tangible evidences of improvement among southern blacks. Illiterates of both races should be educated "up to the limit of their capacities," but he could speak with more assurance of the results of "educating white men of English stocks." As they had greater capacity, as well as greater tolerance, in dealing with illiterate as well as educated Negroes, Brown concluded that the improvement of "the whites is the safest, the easiest, the wisest first step to take."<sup>46</sup>

If Brown needed outside stimulus to convince him that he should try his pen at a novel, it was provided in 1900 by Walter H. Page, who recommended "a straight-forward, rip-roaring, exciting historical novel on the war between the States." The proverbial romance could be built around "the great dramatic events" of the war, and the story should depict social conditions and domestic life. Through this medium Brown could present the history of the Confederacy to millions who could be reached in no other way.<sup>47</sup> He wrote the novel, but gave it an ante-bellum rather than a war setting, and published it with Macmillan rather than with Doubleday, Page and Company. He entitled it *A Gentleman of the South: A Memory of the Black Belt, from the Manuscript Memoirs of the Late Colonel Stanton Elmore* (1903). The manuscript was, Brown said on the title page, "Edited Without Change," and he explained in the preface that he discovered it among Elmore's papers.<sup>48</sup> It would not be difficult to detect Brown's subter-

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, 247-71.

<sup>47</sup> Walter H. Page to Brown, August 9, 1900, in Brown Papers.

<sup>48</sup> William G. Brown, *A Gentleman of the South: A Memory of the Black Belt* (New York, 1903), 9-10.

fuge from a reading of the novel even if there were no other evidence that he was author rather than editor. It would have been better if he had performed only editorial duties. Fortunately, he was convinced that he should stick to history.

One of Brown's severest but kindest critics was Thayer, editor of the *Harvard Graduates' Magazine*, to which Brown frequently contributed. He appreciated Brown's gift and kept him conscious of the need for precision in his writing. After commending *Andrew Jackson*, Thayer wrote: "Go on! and when your hand has complete mastery over language, take some great subject, and put your best into it."<sup>49</sup> With the uninspired *Oliver Ellsworth* completed, Brown informed Thayer that he was contemplating a life of Robert E. Lee, and that there was a possibility he could have access to the voluminous material on the Virginian assembled by George F. R. Henderson, Stonewall Jackson's biographer. "Admiration for Lee grows on me," Brown wrote, but a successful "biographer should have the very rare kind of literary art that is most like a sculptor's." Thayer's reply is not available, but Brown wrote again a week later: "I understand perfectly, I think, & appreciate highly, your wishing me an obsession by a great theme, but does that kind of thing ever happen after disillusionment? . . . I agree that the biographer should be fascinated, absorbed, convinced, from the start."<sup>50</sup>

The "Lee" did not materialize, nor did various other projects Brown had in mind. At Hart's invitation he contracted to write a volume tentatively entitled "Elements of the Civil War" for the American Nation Series, but for some unknown reason he asked to be relieved of the assignment in the fall of 1903.<sup>51</sup> He planned a biography of Ulysses S. Grant for the Macmillan Company,<sup>52</sup> and the editor of the *American Illustrated Magazine* offered him \$300 an installment for twelve to

<sup>49</sup> Thayer to Brown, November 27, 1900, in Brown Papers. See also, Brown to Thayer, May 14, 1905, *ibid.*

<sup>50</sup> Brown to Thayer, May 23, June 1, 1906, in Thayer Manuscripts.

<sup>51</sup> Hart to Brown, September 28, 1903; Harper and Brothers to Brown, October 12, 1903, in Brown Papers.

<sup>52</sup> Caffey to Brown, December 23, 1910, *ibid.*

fourteen articles on Grant for serial publication.<sup>53</sup> He also contracted with Macmillan to write a history of the United States since the Civil War, but this volume had to be abandoned, though several essays on the Reconstruction period appeared in the *Atlantic Monthly*.<sup>54</sup>

The man who knew Brown most intimately was uncertain "whether 'man of letters,' 'essayist,' or 'historian' more nearly describes him."<sup>55</sup> Three of his books—the *Lower South*, the *Foe of Compromise*, and the *New Politics*—appeared first, either in whole or in part, as contributions to periodicals. The list of magazines in which he published articles is in itself an eloquent tribute to his genius as a stylist. Perhaps his best essays were published in the *Atlantic Monthly*, but he contributed also to the *Century*, the *North American Review*, the *Fortnightly Review*, the *Independent*, the *Outlook*, *Youth's Companion*, *Harper's Weekly*, *Harper's Bazaar*, the *Dial*, the *Critic*, the *Nation*, the *South Atlantic Quarterly*, and the *Harvard Graduates' Magazine*. Articles and reviews also appeared in such professional magazines as the *American Historical Review* and the *American Journal of Sociology*. In addition to a series of letters from a southern tour published in the *Boston Evening Transcript*, he contributed to the *New York Evening Post* and the *Montgomery Advertiser*. An *Atlantic* article on "Golf" was subsequently published as a booklet. Few writers have received so wide an accept-

<sup>53</sup> Ellery Sedgwick to Brown, December 16, 1905, *ibid.* Sedgwick, editor of the magazine, suggested articles of 8,000 to 10,000 words to begin in the November, 1906, issue, and end in the December, 1907, number.

<sup>54</sup> Caffey to Brown, December 23, 1910, *ibid.* For the series of Reconstruction articles, captioned "The Tenth Decade of the United States," see *Atlantic Monthly*, XCV (1905), 577-94, 766-80; XCVI (1905), 31-39, 359-76, 760-75; XCVII (1906), 465-88.

In 1903 Frederic C. Howe invited Brown to contribute a biography of John Jay to a five-volume series, "The Lives of the Chief Justices." Howe to Brown, November 18, 1903, in Brown Papers. In the same year Alexander Jessup asked Brown to write a volume for the "American Men of Action" series. Jessup to Brown, December 8, 1903, *ibid.* J. Henry Harper, of Harper and Brothers, invited Brown in 1905 to prepare a biography of George William Curtis "that shall tell the story of his work, both political and literary." Harper to Brown, September 25, 1905, *ibid.* Earlier, in 1903, the Baker and Taylor Company of New York had written Brown: "We have noted with very great interest the success of your recent books, and wish that we might confer with you regarding any forthcoming work which you have either in process or in contemplation." Baker and Taylor Company to Brown, November 21, 1903, *ibid.* There were scores of requests for contributions to magazines, encyclopedias, and other co-operative works.

<sup>55</sup> Caffey, "William Garrett Brown," *loc. cit.*, 159.

ance of their literary output. Fewer still have been able to make a living with their pens, but this Brown accomplished most of the time from 1906 to 1913 despite the fact that tuberculosis not only sapped his strength but also increased his financial obligations.<sup>56</sup>

Some of Brown's essays which appeared in book form have already been analyzed. The subject matter of some others is unrelated to history and cannot concern us here, though method and reception may be illustrated. The best of them, "The Foe of Compromise," uses an historical springboard—the Compromise of 1850, with Rufus Choate as the orator of compromise and William L. Garrison as its foe—but it employs abstractions to point a thesis. Its publication in the *Atlantic Monthly* stirred a mild sensation on both sides of the Atlantic. An English woman who had spent a dozen years searching "for Truth, and a reliable theory of Life & Duty," studied it "with impassioned interest" and transcribed it in a notebook. "Almost every sentence in it found a thrilling response in my consciousness," she wrote, "and some parts of it stirred the very 'deeps' of my experience and hope & aspiration. . . . The whole of it swayed me: I rose & fell with its thought & feeling. . . . It is to me like a supreme vision of the tragedy & the greatness of the *seeing* soul's passage through the immeasurable mystery."<sup>57</sup> In phraseology that anyone can understand, Paul E. More, literary editor

<sup>56</sup> For book royalties, which were rather small, see Caffey to Brown, December 23, 1910; Macmillan Company to Brown, April 30, 1912, in Brown Papers. It is probable that Brown received \$200 per month from *Harper's Weekly*, 1908-1913, though the amount may have been increased to \$250. From *Harper's Bazaar* he was paid \$40 for "a monthly synopsis (2000 words) of the most important questions before the public, discussing each topic briefly for the special interest of the women." This arrangement continued from February, 1910, until April, 1912. Elizabeth Jordan to Brown, January 21, February 10, 1910; April 22, 1912, *ibid.* From the spring of 1912 until shortly before his death in 1913, Brown contributed two articles of 300 to 700 words each per month to the *Youth's Companion*, for which he received \$15 per article. Thompson to Brown, March 21, 1912, *ibid.* For his *Atlantic Monthly* articles on "The Seventh Decade of the United States," Brown received \$150 each. Bliss Perry to Brown, May 5, 1905, *ibid.*

<sup>57</sup> Jeanne Mitchell, Lynwood, Nottingham, to Brown, April 23, 1903, *ibid.* See also, "A Woman," Berlin, to Brown, April 25, 1903 (a seven-page letter), *ibid.* The article appeared in the *Atlantic Monthly*, XCI (1903), 480-94; and in the *Fortnightly Review* (London, 1865- ), N. S. LXXIII (1903), 646-64. It was reprinted as the title essay in *The Foe of Compromise and Other Essays* (New York, 1903), 11-64. For correspondence relative to publication in the *Fortnightly Review*, see W. L. Courtney, London, to Brown, January 9, February 28, April 6, 1903, in Brown Papers.

of the *Independent*, caught a "glimpse of greatness in pure literature"; he praised it as "a rarely excellent piece of literary work."<sup>58</sup> And a Chicago friend wrote that "this rings the bell. Haven't liked anything so well since Virginibus Puevisque and there are places where you have Stevenson—but we shant blaspheme. Please write some more like it."<sup>59</sup>

While only an intellectual can comprehend "The Foe of Compromise," any "honest duffer" can fathom "Golf."<sup>60</sup> This essay, inspired by his own love for the game, elicited commendation at home and abroad. It reveals in the author a sense of humor, a grasp of human nature, a philosophical comprehension, an appreciation of the relationship between the animate and the inanimate, and a vocabulary approaching an artillery of words. It is a masterpiece of diction, accomplished without verbal topping, hooking, or slicing.

In the winter and spring of 1904, Brown made a tour of the South to report conditions for the Boston *Evening Transcript*. His Alabama background, frequent vacations in various parts of the South from Virginia to Texas, the excellence of the *Lower South in American History*, and his penetrating analyses of southern problems in sundry periodicals brought him to the attention of the *Transcript* publishers as a person capable of competent observation and impartial reporting. The arrangement stipulated a compensation of \$400 for twenty articles, plus railroad and pullman transportation.<sup>61</sup> For some reason Brown desired anonymity, and all of them were published over the pseudonym "Stanton."<sup>62</sup> In introducing the series of letters, captioned "The South at Work," the *Transcript* identified the correspondent as "a Southern

<sup>58</sup> [Paul E. More], editorial in the *Independent* (New York, 1848-1928), LV (1903), 812; More to Brown, April 9, 1903, in Brown Papers.

<sup>59</sup> Vincent J. Walsh to Brown, April 8, 1903, in Brown Papers.

<sup>60</sup> William G. Brown, "Golf," in *Atlantic Monthly*, LXXXIX (1902), 725-35. For comment by a Canadian golfer, see T. Arnold Hamilton, Toronto, to Brown, July 6, 1902, in Brown Papers. On June 5, 1902, Brown signed a contract with Houghton Mifflin and Company to reprint the article as a booklet, *Golf* (Boston, 1902). The author was to receive a royalty of ten per cent on all copies sold up to 5,000, fifteen per cent on all sold over that number. The contract is in the Brown Papers.

<sup>61</sup> Frank B. Tracy to R. L. O'Brien, February 10, 1904; Tracy to Brown, February 10, 1904, in Brown Papers.

<sup>62</sup> Tracy to Brown, February 8, 1904, *ibid.*; Boston *Evening Transcript*, February 27, 1904.

man with Northern education and residence," who was "peculiarly well equipped to make an exposition as well as an interpretation of the development of the industrial South."<sup>63</sup> There was only one point of disagreement between correspondent and editor: as 1904 was the fiftieth anniversary of Olmsted's journey, Brown desired to make "pretty constant reference" to the New Yorker's observations by way of contrasts and comparisons, but this approach was discouraged. "That is going rather too far back," the editor wrote. "What we want to know is how the South is picking up now and how it has improved in the last ten years." The *Transcript* was no longer "a repository of reminiscences"; it was interested in "*news*—new things, new enterprises, new aspects of old problems and prospects for the future."<sup>64</sup>

Brown adjusted his method to meet the desires of his employers, although conformity to a journalistic pattern sacrificed historical perspective and compromised a graceful and charming style. He could not forget that he was historian, however, and despite editorial policy he occasionally alluded to events of the ante-bellum and postwar generations.<sup>65</sup> While he undertook the tour with certain definite notions about the South, he did not hesitate to change his mind if he found new evidence. His attitude toward the Negro was still an Alabama point of view, slightly liberalized by northern residence and schooling. Like Olmsted, Brown began his itinerary at Washington, D. C., and between the last of February and the middle of May he traversed the seaboard states from Virginia to Texas.<sup>66</sup> As a newspaper reporter, he inter-

<sup>63</sup> Boston *Evening Transcript*, February 27, 1904.

<sup>64</sup> Tracy to Brown, February 9, 10, 1904; Tracy to O'Brien, February 10, 1904, *ibid.*

<sup>65</sup> With few exceptions, Tracy was pleased with Brown's articles: "Your Durham letter is a tip-top one and is quite a model. I think, however, that a few statistics put into these letters will assist them. . . . The Richmond letter was a trifle scattering, although interesting and good. . . . These little touches that you put into your letters in regard to shooting quail in this or that place, etc., are very attractive and show that you are familiar with your surroundings." Tracy to Brown, March 8, 1904, *ibid.*

<sup>66</sup> The itinerary, the dates of the letters, and the issues of the *Transcript* in which they were published follow: Washington, D. C., February 25, in Boston *Evening Transcript*, February 27, 1904, p. 20; Richmond, Va., March 1, *ibid.*, March 5, 1904, p. 20; Durham N. C., March 3, *ibid.*, March 9, 1904, p. [14]; Pinehurst, N. C., March 9, *ibid.*, March 12, 1904, p. 20; Columbia, S. C., March 14, *ibid.*, March 19, 1904, p. 12; Jacksonville, Fla., March 21, *ibid.*, March 26, 1904, p. 20; Orlando, Fla., March 23, *ibid.*, March 30,



viewed governors, legislators, businessmen, laborers, farmers, consuls, commissioners of agriculture, commerce, and immigration—hundreds of persons, he said, “from mill men to ranchmen, from governors to teamsters.” He purposely sought out the South’s “busiest men rather than people of leisure,” and on the whole tour he did not experience “a single rudeness, a single incivility.”<sup>67</sup>

Brown emphasized half a dozen major southern problems in his letters and wrote briefly about many others. His visit to Durham provided grist for a report on the tobacco industry and its central figure, the Duke family. A letter from Columbia treated the cotton textile mills and conditions under which their white laborers worked. From Orlando he described the Florida citrus industry. The Birmingham article concentrated on the city’s iron and steel business. The Jackson stop-over gave opportunity to discuss reactionary politics as exemplified by Governor James K. Vardaman’s administration; the Greenville sojourn provided a proper setting to describe the tenant system in the delta region and the preference for Negro labor; and his stay at Vicksburg prompted a story of the levees and the need for further flood control. From Houston he wrote of rice cultivation; from College Station, Texas, cotton production and the boll weevil menace; from Austin, the University of Texas; from Santa Gertrudes Ranch, cattle raising; from Cleburne, the southern caste system. He discussed the manufacture of locomotives at Richmond, the historical significance of graveyards, the Theodore Roosevelt—Booker T. Washington episode, experiments with Italian and Chinese laborers on cotton plantations, the New Orleans cotton exchange, by-products from cotton manufacture, the evil effects

1904, p. 16; Marion, Ala., March 26, *ibid.*, April 2, 1904, p. 20; Birmingham, Ala., April 1, *ibid.*, April 13, 1904, p. 16; Jackson, Miss., April 2, *ibid.*, April 20, 1904, p. 18; Greenville, Miss., April 4, *ibid.*, April 23, 1904, p. 26; Vicksburg, Miss., April 7, *ibid.*, April 27, 1904, p. 18; New Orleans, La., April 8, *ibid.*, April 30, 1904, p. 26; Houston, Tex., April 12, *ibid.*, May 4, 1904, p. 18; College Station, Tex., April 14, *ibid.*, May 7, 1904, p. 26; Santa Gertrudes Ranch, Tex., April 16, *ibid.*, May 11, 1904, p. 8; Austin, Tex., April 19, *ibid.*, May 18, 1904, p. 18; Cleburne, Tex., April 28, *ibid.*, May 21, 1904, p. 36; Cleburne, Tex., May 14, *ibid.*, May 28, 1904, p. 27; St. Louis, Mo., May 28, *ibid.*, June 1, 1904, p. [24].

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*, June 1, 1904.

of the Civil War and Reconstruction, and the Bassett affair at Trinity College.

He made it clear in the first letter that "the present and true 'Southern Question' is the question of how to make money out of the South's resources," not the Negro problem. In determining why the region lagged industrially, the Negro was only a part of the picture. "The lack of competent and persistent labor among the whites is the matter. A low standard of living is the matter. Ignorance and illiteracy is the matter."<sup>68</sup> He did not penetrate far into the South before he concluded that there was little support for an opinion, expressed at the beginning of his tour, that the "lowest point in the efficiency of Negro labor has been reached and passed." Governors Andrew J. Montague of Virginia, Charles B. Aycock of North Carolina, and Duncan C. Heyward of South Carolina, as well as many other individuals in those states, agreed "that the Negro as a laborer is deteriorating." The prevailing southern attitude was that "It is 'up to them to make good' under freedom," and the verdict of the first three states he traversed was that they had failed.<sup>69</sup> In New Orleans he found that the Negro was steadily "losing ground" as a laborer, and most of Texas got along very well without him.<sup>70</sup> But in Florida he discovered a "feeling of satisfaction with the Negro and with Negro labor," and the delta region still preferred him.<sup>71</sup> Summarizing his findings near the end of the tour, he painted a discouraging picture. Free Negro labor in 1904 was ineffective for the same reasons that slave labor was inefficient a half century before. Absenteeism prevailed; Negroes quit jobs without notice, as they absconded in slavery days; the "fear of punishment" was still the only effective discipline; theft and waste "were besetting sins" of freedmen as they were of slaves. Slave labor was expensive in the Old South; "Negro labor in the South is still, I am convinced, more costly than white labor in the North."<sup>72</sup>

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*, February 27, 1904.

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid.*, March 9, 26, 1904.

<sup>70</sup> *Ibid.*, April 30, May 4, 7, 11, 18, 21, 28, 1904.

<sup>71</sup> *Ibid.*, March 26, April 23, 1904.

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid.*, May 28, 1904.

It was reassuring to note that the caste system did not forbid manual labor by whites. This not only encouraged immigration; it also made the white man's standard of competence the controlling factor. When this situation obtained to a greater degree, the South would offer less inducement to the Negro, for he remained largely because a living was possible "without hard, intelligent work, without habits of foresight and saving."<sup>73</sup> Despite his pessimistic view of the Negro, Brown was encouraged about the prospects for both industrial and agricultural development of the South. Everywhere he saw men at work as never before. A central theme of his report on "The South at Work" was "the advancing South."

Mention has been made of the fact that Brown was interested in politics and perhaps was ambitious for a political career. He carried with him from Alabama to Cambridge a predilection for the Democratic faith. He joined the Young Men's Democratic Club of Massachusetts, helped to organize the Democratic Campaign Club of Harvard University in 1892, and took the stump for Grover Cleveland in Rhode Island and Massachusetts. During the next few years he frequented Democratic state conventions, served on his party's state committee, and in 1896 attended the Democratic national convention. In the same year he became a prime mover in organizing the William E. Russell Club of Cambridge, and served as chairman of its executive committee. At the turn of the century he wrote: "Still call myself a Democrat, but the title is disputed by acquaintances of the silver persuasion."<sup>74</sup> William J. Bryan's third candidacy in 1908 drove Brown into the Republican camp, and he labored to carry North Carolina for William H. Taft.<sup>75</sup>

At the same time opportunity came to write political articles for *Harper's Weekly*, then under the editorial direction of George Harvey. As a contributor he was associated with Edward S. Martin, another Harvard graduate, although Brown was forced to do his writing

<sup>73</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>74</sup> *Harvard College, Class of 1891, Secretary's Report, No. 2, p. 13; ibid., No. 3, pp. 9-10.*

<sup>75</sup> Brown to Martin, July 2, 1910, in Brown Papers.

wherever he happened to be sojourning at the time, whether at some eastern summer residence or at a southern sanitarium in winter. Unable longer to write books because of inability to gather material or to maintain sustained effort, he could, except in physical crises, follow political trends, analyze issues, and occasionally write longer articles for other magazines.

Brown's special assignments included the tariff, monetary reform, and southern politics, and most of the "Comment" that appeared in the *Weekly* on these subjects during Taft's administration and the early years of Wilson's came from his pen. Aside from following these issues, he published full-page feature articles on the retiring and incoming presidents in 1909 and again in 1913. Under the captions "To Theodore Roosevelt: Greeting!" and "To William H. Taft: Greeting!"<sup>76</sup> he addressed them in such delectable analyses that *Weekly* readers lifted their eyebrows. They so impressed Mark Twain that he penned his "congratulations"—mistakenly to Harvey. They surpassed all other "bowings of the one President out & the other one in. . . Yours are certainly masterpieces, in fitness, fairness, wisdom, depth, candor, compactness, lucidity, grace of style, felicitous expression . . . composure, the gravity & the fine dignity meet for the occasion."<sup>77</sup> The performance was repeated in 1913 with "Greetings" to Taft and Wilson.<sup>78</sup> Armed with an advance copy, Colonel Edward M. House presented the Wilson article to his dinner guest on the evening of February 28. The President-elect read it aloud and exclaimed, "'it is a classic' and again 'it is a noble utterance.'" Wilson was so favorably impressed that he suggested publication in capital newspapers as a "companion piece to his Inaugural Address. . . He also wanted to know if it were pos-

<sup>76</sup> *Harper's Weekly* (New York, 1857-1916), LIII (1909), March 6, pp. 7, 9. These articles were reprinted in William G. Brown, *The New Politics and Other Papers* (Boston, 1914), 197-205, 206-15.

<sup>77</sup> Photostat of letter, "Mark" to "Dear Colonel," in *Harper's Weekly*, LIII (1909), March 20, p. 6. Harvey appended a note: "We did not write the articles so highly and so justly commended by Mr. Clemens. Both were composed by Mr. William Garrott Brown, a frequent and esteemed contributor to these columns."

<sup>78</sup> *Ibid.*, LVII (1913), March 1, pp. 6-7; March 8, p. 7. These articles were reprinted in Brown, *New Politics*, 216-25, 226-35.

sible to distribute several thousand copies among the assembled crowds."<sup>79</sup>

Much as Brown was interested in tariff and monetary reform, his desire to improve political conditions in the South transcended all other motives in his contributions to the *Weekly*. Until 1911 he depended upon presidential aid. He lauded Taft's southern policy as announced in his inaugural address, praised his independence in appointing non-machine Republicans and Democrats to office, and commended his timely and tactful speeches at Atlanta and Charlotte. He characterized Taft as "a President whom the South is beginning to like"; no President since Abraham Lincoln had exhibited such fairness; not even the Democratic Cleveland "has accomplished so much to break down sectional barriers and fully reannex eleven States to the Union."<sup>80</sup>

It was Brown's ambition to convert "The Thinkless South" into a two-party region by reforming Republican organizations which had long been cliques of Federal officeholders.<sup>81</sup> To promote a normal and healthy political activity, the machines in the several states must be destroyed. The politician presently responsible for them was Postmaster General Frank H. Hitchcock, whose "referee" in each state, usually the head of the Republican machine, controlled Federal patronage. Reform activity might well begin in North Carolina, for that state had cast 115,000 votes for Taft in 1908 and elected three Republican congressmen. The contest there, Brown wrote, "is for the control of the State Committee, but the real issue is between the pie-counter

<sup>79</sup> Edward M. House to Brown, March 1, 1913, in Brown Papers. House continued: "Our friend, Martin, has kindly arranged for this through Colonel Harvey. Three thousand leaflets of it will be sent to Washington on Monday night and I am arranging with the Secretary of the Inaugural Committee to have them properly distributed. Martin thought your name should be placed on the article and I hope this will be done for, in my opinion, you have contributed a permanent piece of literature." *Ibid.*

Harvey changed his mind, concluding that "distribution would seem like butting in for an advertisement." Martin to Brown, March 3, 1913, *ibid.* See also, House to Brown, March 9, 15, 1913, *ibid.*

<sup>80</sup> *Harper's Weekly*, LIII (1909), February 6, p. 4; *ibid.*, March 20, p. 4; *ibid.*, May 29, p. 4; *ibid.*, June 5, p. 4; *ibid.*, November 13, pp. 4-5; *ibid.*, LIV (1910), August 13, p. 4. See also, William G. Brown, "President Taft's Opportunity," in *Century* (New York, 1870-1930), LXXVIII (1909), 252-59, reprinted in Brown, *New Politics*, 165-94.

<sup>81</sup> *Harper's Weekly*, LII (1908), November 7, p. 4; *ibid.*, November 28, pp. 4-5.

and the men who want a party that shall stand for something other than the pie-counter."<sup>82</sup> Two such North Carolinians were Congressmen John M. Morehead and Thomas Settle, who urged Brown "to come to Ashville and 'get in the game.'"<sup>83</sup> Brown did not get to the convention, but he wrote the platform which was adopted without serious modification. It was a thoroughly "anti-pie-counter" document, which "utterly and emphatically repudiates that notion of . . . [the party's] character and function which would make of it a mere machine for distributing Federal offices and electing delegates to national conventions. We proclaim ourselves a true party, and no machine. We need no dictator, and we will submit to no dictation."<sup>84</sup> But while the reform Republicans captured control of the party in North Carolina, they did not succeed in electing any members to Congress in 1910.<sup>85</sup> It was a Democratic year.

Through the instrumentality of A. Piatt Andrew, assistant secretary of the treasury, Brown was invited to Washington to confer with Taft and the Secretary of the Treasury on the Republican party in the South. As Brown was physically unable to make the trip, an interview was arranged with the President in New York City, but apparently it did not materialize.<sup>86</sup> A communication to the President's secretary reached Taft, who wrote Brown: "I have never read an article that is so illuminating and satisfactory on the Southern situation as your letter. I agree with you in every particular."<sup>87</sup> Other correspondence followed, and

<sup>82</sup> *Ibid.*, LIII (1909), January 9, p. 5; *ibid.*, LIV (1910), January 15, pp. 4-5; *ibid.*, February 26, p. 5; *ibid.*, April 16, p. 4; *ibid.*, May 21, pp. 4-5; *ibid.*, June 11, p. 5; *ibid.*, July 9, p. 5; *ibid.*, August 13, p. 4; Brown to Martin, July 2, 1910; Brown, to John M. Morehead, July 4, 1910; Brown to Eugene L. Brown, July 4, 1910; A. Piatt Andrew to Brown, September 19, 1910, in Brown Papers.

<sup>83</sup> Thomas Settle to Brown, March 4, 1910; Morehead to Brown, March 10, April 16, May 25, 1910, *ibid.*

<sup>84</sup> *Harper's Weekly*, LIV (1910), August 20, p. 4; Gilliam Grissom to Brown, July 23, 1910; Settle to Brown, July 27, August 3, 1910; Morehead to Brown, August 3, 1910; Brown to Morehead, October 21, 1910; Brown to Andrew, September 22, 1910, in Brown Papers.

<sup>85</sup> *Harper's Weekly*, LIV (1910), November 26, p. 4.

<sup>86</sup> Andrew to Brown, September 19, 28 (telegram), 29 (telegram), 1910; Brown to Andrew, September 22, 1910, in Brown Papers.

<sup>87</sup> William H. Taft to Brown, November 3, 1910, *ibid.* See also, for Brown's interviews and correspondence with Taft's secretary, Brown to Morehead, October 21, 1910;

on May 30, 1911, Brown strongly recommended that the President, as the head of the party, should make an unequivocal declaration that Federal patronage should not be used to secure support for his nomination by the Republican national convention, that officeholders must not neglect their responsibilities to engage in party activity, and that political bargains should be considered as disqualifying an applicant for the office he sought. Brown fully realized the significance of the step he was proposing, and he anticipated the reaction of politicians toward it. He provided the President with valid reasons why the move was expedient: 'Taft's nomination was a foregone conclusion, the real contest would be in the election; the President's position before the electorate would be strengthened, particularly with advocates of civil service reform; total destruction of the "pie-counter" system would complete a praiseworthy southern program; such action would destroy practices that were "wrong and mean and dangerous to our institutions."' <sup>88</sup> Copies of Brown's letter to Taft were sent to the Treasury Department, Henry C. Lodge, and Samuel W. McCall, imploring their aid in promoting reform,<sup>89</sup> but Brown soon learned from Taft's secretary "that the President has considered the matter and has decided to take no action. It is receiving his attention, but he will not act on it impulsively, for it contemplates a revolution in a venerable system which operates in fourteen or fifteen states."<sup>90</sup> The political reformer understood that he could expect no support from the administration.

Meanwhile, anticipating such an eventuality, Brown had been contemplating a searching investigation of Republican politics in the South. Early in 1911 he approached the *New York Times* on publishing a series of articles on the subject. He would prepare a statement on the historical background of the Republican machines, and data from the several southern states would be assembled by a competent newspaper

Andrew to Brown, November 3, 1910, *ibid.* For reply to the President's letter, see Brown to Taft, November 7, 1910, *ibid.*

<sup>88</sup> Brown to Taft, May 30, 1911, *ibid.*

<sup>89</sup> Brown to Andrew, May 30, 1911; Brown to Henry C. Lodge, May 30, 1911; Brown to Samuel W. McCall, May 30, 1911; Lodge to Brown, June 1, 1911, *ibid.*

<sup>90</sup> Charles D. Hillis to Brown, June 17, 1911, *ibid.*

reporter with Washington and southern experience but without muck-raking proclivities.<sup>91</sup> But the *Times* would not sponsor the project; *Harper's Weekly* and the *New York Evening Post* also declined. Rollo Ogden of the *Post* explained that if Brown himself could "make the investigation, and . . . send us some letters, the case would be different."<sup>92</sup>

Disgusted with Roosevelt and disappointed in Taft, Brown hoped that some acceptable Democrat would be presented. Wilson did not appeal to him. In the spring of 1909, when Harvey was grooming the Princeton President for the governorship, Brown asked Martin if he could not "coax the Colonel down off that moribund Wilson hobby? I know President Wilson, & admire him, but—! You and I are in the running if he is."<sup>93</sup> With Wilson in the governorship, Harvey pushed him for the presidency, and encouraged *Weekly* contributors "to say something helpful."<sup>94</sup> Brown, who had been promoting the work of the Commission on Monetary Reform, read Wilson's Texas speech with alarm and determined to set him right before endorsing his candidacy. A five-page letter, urging careful study of the Commission's report, asked Wilson not to "throw away what Cleveland kept, what Roosevelt lost—the confidence of men of your class." "And don't," Brown begged him, "do as Taft did recently, after inviting my advice about his Southern policy—pat *me* on the back with a compliment and disregard my advice."<sup>95</sup> The letter "made a great impression upon" Wilson. Admitting that he "went off half cocked" because he distrusted everything with the Aldrich stamp, he promised "dispassionate and open-minded treatment" of the issue. He lamented that the actual business of government left no "time for careful investigation. I seem almost obliged to form conclusions from impressions instead of from

<sup>91</sup> Brown to Editor of the *Times*, January 3, 1911, *ibid.*

<sup>92</sup> Brown to Martin, November 27, December 6, 1911; Martin to Brown, December 4, 1911; Rollo Ogden to Brown, December 11, 1911, *ibid.*

<sup>93</sup> Brown to Martin, May 19, 1909, *ibid.*

<sup>94</sup> Martin to Brown, November 8, 1911, *ibid.*

<sup>95</sup> Brown to Woodrow Wilson, October 30, 1911, *ibid.* Writing to Andrew about his Wilson letter, Brown said: "The La Follette crowd are going to make Taft wish he had taken me seriously." Brown to Andrew, November 2, 1911, *ibid.*



study.”<sup>96</sup> This frank confession completely disarmed Brown, and he notified Martin that Wilson’s reply had “simply made me his’n.” He would back Wilson to the limit even if he had “to hire the *Outlook* to do it with.” As paper writing would not insure a nomination, Harvey should immediately “get Wilson’s boom into responsible hands for systematic management.”<sup>97</sup>

Wilson’s advisers were soon in touch with Brown. House wished he could meet with a small group in New York City—Wilson, Martin, Page, David F. Houston, William F. McCombs, and himself. Could he supply the names of Massachusetts Democrats who should be contacted? McCombs, campaign manager, invited suggestions as to proper men for the Wilson organization, particularly in the South.<sup>98</sup> And then, early in 1912, the bubble burst. Wilson decided that the *Weekly’s* support was hurting his candidacy, and asked Harvey to withdraw it. As Martin explained it to Brown, the impression had got abroad in the West that the *Weekly* was John P. Morgan’s mouthpiece. Brown agreed that Harvey had been treated shamefully, offered to help refute the charge, and concluded that fear of Bryan had caused the move.<sup>99</sup>

It was at this stage that a friend wrote Brown to learn if he were still “a Republican or are you back with us Democrats?”<sup>100</sup> Brown replied that he was not a Republican, but that his first obligation had been “to smash Roosevelt.” He hoped he could “support a Democrat this time. My greatest fear is that somebody with Bryanite notions of finance will be named.” Judson Harmon and Oscar Underwood were trustworthy, but Clark and Wilson were not. The last “has been making some pretty wild speeches, & Clark’s antecedents are thoroughly bad. Some personal correspondence with Wilson has failed to reassure me.” He admitted that Wilson’s nomination had improved the “politi-

<sup>96</sup> Wilson to Brown, November 7, 1911, *ibid.*

<sup>97</sup> Brown to Martin, November 10, 17, 1911, *ibid.* See also, Brown to Andrew, November 10, 1911, *ibid.*, in which Brown wrote: “You never saw a franker, manlier letter.”

<sup>98</sup> House to Brown, December 7, 14, 1911; William F. McCombs to Brown, December 20, 1911, *ibid.*

<sup>99</sup> Martin to Brown, January 5, 1912; Brown to Martin, January 7, February 8, 1912; Eugene L. Brown to Martin, January 24, 1912, *ibid.*

<sup>100</sup> Jeremiah Smith to Brown, January 11, 1912, *ibid.*

cal outlook . . . but I can't think much better of Bryan for it. The platform is pretty bad, & he is responsible."<sup>101</sup>

Brown was, as has been indicated, interested in currency reform. He had entrée to the Treasury Department through the assistant secretary, who wrote him that "no one in the country is working for the monetary legislation to more purpose than yourself. It is truly splendid."<sup>102</sup> Beyond articles in *Harper's Weekly*, Brown's contribution consisted mainly in promoting conferences and correspondence between administration leaders and leading Democrats such as Wilson, Underwood, and House. During and after the campaign of 1912, House plied Brown with innumerable questions on the monetary problem. "I feel that you know more about the Aldrich Bill," he wrote, "than anyone else in whom I have confidence."<sup>103</sup>

Displaying a lively interest in Wilson's appointments, Brown had a "deep design" to effect Charles W. Eliot's assignment to the State Department. "Think . . . what a figure Eliot would make in the approaching centenary of the Treaty of Ghent—& of Eliot & Bryce put in charge of the Panama controversy! For I believe a hint of the appointment would keep Bryce in Washington."<sup>104</sup> After learning that Bryan would be named, he wrote Martin: "It's going to be distasteful work defending the administration with a patent-medicine statesman at the head of the table."<sup>105</sup> Cabinet selections were "extremely disappointing—the weakest in my recollection." As to Josephus Daniels, "There would have been some excuse for giving him Frank Hitchcock's job—one smart Alec succeeding another."<sup>106</sup> Page was "not up to the place" as ambassador to England. "He is an expert hatcher of other birds'

<sup>101</sup> Brown to Smith, May 5, July 3, 1912, *ibid.*

<sup>102</sup> Andrew to Brown, December 5, 1911, *ibid.* See also Andrew to Brown, September 19, 1910, *ibid.*, in which Andrew wrote: "I have for sometime come to feel that your editorials in Harper's Weekly are the most sensible as also the most entertaining that are being written. In fact I have constituted myself a sort of press agent for the Weekly and go about telling everyone not to miss what you are saying from week to week."

<sup>103</sup> House to Brown, March 18, 1912, *ibid.* See also, House to Brown, April 9, December 8, 1912; February 28, March 15, 21, April 10, 1913, *ibid.*

<sup>104</sup> Brown to Martin, January 23, 1913, *ibid.*

<sup>105</sup> Brown to Martin, January 30, 1913, *ibid.*

<sup>106</sup> Brown to Martin, March 2, 1913, *ibid.*

eggs; . . . Besides, Wilson is appointing too many Southerners." He could not accept House's explanation that able northern Democrats were as scarce as competent southern Republicans. It "simply isn't so. I've mentioned a few life-long Democrats in Massachusetts whom Wilson apparently hasn't considered."<sup>107</sup>

Brown did not long survive the return of the Democracy to power; and his death at the age of forty-five, on October 19, 1913, at New Canaan, Connecticut, terminated his efforts to contribute "a little towards making things go right in public affairs, which have been my life-long passion."<sup>108</sup> What he might have accomplished in the brief life span allotted him had he not been handicapped by deafness and tuberculosis can only be conjectured. Although keenly aware of his condition and its effects on his career, he seldom complained of the isolation which it imposed. Writing to a friend in 1910, he expressed his pleasure in working for *Harper's Weekly*, but added: "the work comes too near being the only pleasure I get. Without the relief of a free body, the solitude of my life is at times about all I can stand for. . . . I know of course it's exile for mine to the finish; I am, I think a good deal deafer, and haven't the vitality for any sustained effort to get at the strangers and semi-strangers about me. But from a child I have foreboded precisely this closer and closer shutting-in of the world! It does not seem to me really manly or honest to try to make believe that work and thought and books are enough. One must be candid with life—most of all with one's own life."<sup>109</sup> But in spite of his isolation, he had

<sup>107</sup> Brown to Martin, April 3, 17, 1913; House to Brown, April 10, 23, 1913, *ibid.*

<sup>108</sup> Brown to Andrew, December 7, 1911, *ibid.*

<sup>109</sup> Brown to Thompson, May 20, 1910, *ibid.* This pathetic note stands in sharp contrast to a telegram in reply to an invitation to attend a dinner in honor of his friend Caffey, who had been appointed solicitor in the Department of Agriculture: "Deeply regret inability to be present at dinner to Colonel Caffey. I raised him from a pup. Only trouble encountered was due to his notion that he was raising me. Submit to the company the question which of us did the better job. I can testify that he is a genuine farmer & true representative of Lowndes County [Alabama]. He may not tell us what is pure food but he can certainly tell us what is whiskey. Before deciding, he will sleep on it. He can sleep on anything. . . . I respectfully suggest a toast to Wilson, Caffey, cut plug tobacco, real whiskey, and the principles of the Democratic party." Brown to Thomas W. Slocum, probably May 6, 1913, *ibid.*

managed to make an impression in the conduct of the Wilson campaign, and it is intriguing to speculate on how the would have performed as a United States senator or in some other public office. Regardless of these unrealized potentialities, however, his writings, both historical and political, represent a substantial contribution to the literature of his time; and through them his capacity for literary craftsmanship was firmly established.

# Robert Wormeley Carter of Sabine Hall: Notes on the Life of a Virginia Planter

BY LOUIS MORTON

The Virginia planters of the eighteenth century, although they produced little in the way of formal literature, were an educated and articulate group. Their extensive business interests demanded detailed records and constant communication with the market at home and abroad. Also, they were inveterate letter-writers, corresponding with each other frequently on public and personal matters. Some kept lengthy journals in which they noted with perfect candor their inmost thoughts, thereby giving to an inquisitive posterity an intimate glimpse of the past. Others, less introspective, contented themselves with recording weather, the condition of their crops, their debts, and the routine events of daily life. To this latter group belongs the diary of Robert Wormeley Carter of Sabine Hall in Richmond County, Virginia.

Robert Wormeley Carter was, in many respects, a typical Virginia planter and his journal is important for the light it throws on the manners and customs of his class. Although Carter apparently kept a diary most of his adult life, the record for only seventeen years has been found.<sup>1</sup> Such of the diary as has been preserved is rich in the de-

<sup>1</sup> Altogether there are 17 diaries, each covering a year of Carter's life from 1764 to 1792, and each entered in a separate notebook or almanac, uniformly about six by four inches. The diaries for 1766, 1768, 1769, 1777, 1780, 1781, 1784, 1785, 1786, 1787, 1790, 1791, 1792 are in the William and Mary College Library; those for 1764 and 1765 are in the Clements Library; the diary of 1774 is in the Archives of the American Antiquarian Society, Worcester, Massachusetts; and the diary for 1776 is the property of Mrs. Armistead Wellford of Sabine Hall, Richmond County, Virginia. I am indebted to Dr. Carl Bridenbaugh and Dr. Lester J. Cappon of the Institute of Early American History and Culture, Williamsburg, Virginia, for making typescript copies of these diaries available to me.

tails relating to the daily activities of a large planter, and from it one can re-create the busy scene of life on a large plantation.

Robert Wormeley Carter, who was born in 1734 and died in 1797, came of a distinguished and wealthy family which for a century had been prominent in Virginia life.<sup>2</sup> John Carter, the emigrant, came to Virginia from England in 1649, and by the time of his death twenty years later he had achieved high political office and had acquired a considerable fortune. He married five times and had many children, but only one of his sons, Robert, lived long enough to perpetuate the family name. This son, commonly called "King" Carter, was the chief architect of the family fortune. By the vigorous use of the many devices prevalent among the magnates of the time, he became the wealthiest and probably the most influential man of his day in Virginia. By appointment and election he held, in rapid succession, the posts of justice of the peace, burgess, speaker of the House, colonial treasurer, councilor, president of the Council, and acting governor. At his death in 1732 he left 330,000 acres of land and over 700 slaves. Married twice, he was survived by eight children, all of whom occupied important places in the life of the colony. They wed so often and so well that a list of "King" Carter's descendants reads like a roster of eminent Virginians.

Landon Carter, the fourth son of "King" and the father of Robert Wormeley, fell heir to a comfortable fortune consisting of two plantations on the York River, three in Richmond County, and a supply of slaves, cattle, and equipment. In addition he inherited extensive tracts in the back country of the Northern Neck, that region lying between the Potomac and the Rappahannock rivers, with an undefined western boundary. For twenty years Landon was a member of the House of Burgesses from Richmond County, and claimed for himself the honor

<sup>2</sup> For the history of the Carter family in Virginia see Robert R. Carter and Marion C. Oliver, *The Carter Family Tree* (Richmond, 1897); Thomas A. Glenn (ed.), *Some Colonial Mansions and Those Who Lived in Them*, 2 vols. (Philadelphia, 1898-1900), I, 217-94; Louis Morton, *Robert Carter of Nomini Hall; A Virginia Tobacco Planter of the Eighteenth Century* (Princeton, 1941), Chapter I; Louis B. Wright, *The First Gentlemen of Virginia* (San Marino, California, 1940), 235-85.

of being among the first to protest the commercial policy of the Mother Country. Over a period of many years he, like his son, kept a diary, valuable as a source for the history of the period as well as for its terse and pointed comments about people and events.<sup>3</sup> In it Carter is revealed as an extremely well-informed and intelligent man, but one with strong convictions which he did not hesitate to impose upon anyone with whom he came in contact. Irascible and impatient, he could brook no opposition, with the result that he was frequently engaged in acrimonious disputes with his friends. More than one of his neighbors felt the full fury of the sharp and biting tongue of the Colonel.

Landon Carter married three times: first, Elizabeth, the daughter of Ralph Wormeley of Rosegill; secondly, Maria, the daughter of William Byrd II of Westover; lastly, Elizabeth, the daughter of Thomas Beale of Richmond County. In all, he had seven children, three sons and four daughters. The sons, Robert Wormeley, Landon, and John, became important figures in the community and large landowners. The daughters, Elizabeth, Lucy, Maria, and Judith, all married into prominent families.

None of Landon's wives lived long, and his later years were passed as a widower, a state which apparently did not suit him well. His diary during these years reveals him to be a most difficult person to live with, crochety and irritable, and constantly complaining of his treatment by his children and friends. His relations with his son, Robert Wormeley, became extremely strained, and the latter contemplated removal from Sabine Hall in 1766 to avoid "being compelled to live with him who told me I was his daily curse."<sup>4</sup> Landon frequently accused his son of disrespect and disobedience, and once, after an argument over some trivial matter, wrote, "I must be provided with pistols; for I am certain

<sup>3</sup> Portions of the diary have been published in the *William and Mary College Quarterly* (Williamsburg, 1892- ), Ser. 1, Vols. XIII-XXI (1904-1912), *passim*. Parts of his diary for 1766 and 1767, written, as were some of his son's, in interleaved copies of the *Virginia Almanack* are in the possession of the William L. Clements Library at Ann Arbor, Michigan.

<sup>4</sup> Entry of August 25, 1766, Robert Wormeley Carter Diary. Unless otherwise noted all diary entries are from Robert Wormeley Carter's diary.

no resolution of mine can otherwise guard agst the consequences.”<sup>5</sup> It is apparent, however, that many of Landon’s comments on his son’s behavior are more an indication of the former’s ill-temper than the latter’s reprehensibility. Had he hated his son, as one writer has said,<sup>6</sup> Landon could have excluded him from his will. Instead, he left him the bulk of the estate, although not required to do so either by law or by the conditions attaching to the land.

As his middle name indicates, Robert Wormeley Carter, the eldest son, was born of Landon’s first marriage. Through his mother his connections were fully as distinguished and valuable as were those on his paternal side. The Wormeley family, whose seat was Rosegill in Middlesex County, owned large estates and held high political office in Virginia generation after generation. There was a Wormeley either on the Council or in the House of Burgesses almost continuously from 1650 to the outbreak of the Revolution when various members of the family became loyalists. As a result much of the political influence of Wormeleys in Virginia was lost, but their social standing and prestige, second to none, remained unimpaired.

Robert Wormeley Carter, then, was heir to a high place in the Virginia aristocracy. On the Council were his first cousins, Robert Carter of Nomini Hall and Ralph Wormeley III of Rosegill, and in the Burgesses his father and other kinsmen played a dominant role. Possessing ability and inclination, he was assured of rapid advancement through his social and political connections. Thus, with a distinguished name and the prospect of a large fortune, Robert Wormeley Carter began life under the most favorable auspices.

Little is known of Carter’s early life, and nothing of his education. Most likely he was given his first formal schooling at Sabine Hall by a tutor, since that was the customary procedure among the planters of the day. Or he may have been tutored at Cleve where Charles Carter, his uncle, maintained a school to which Landon later sent some of his

<sup>5</sup> *William and Mary College Quarterly*, Ser. 1, Vol. XXI (1912), 177.

<sup>6</sup> Irving Brant, *James Madison, the Virginia Revolutionist* (New York, 1941), 197.



grandchildren.<sup>7</sup> He is not listed as a student at the College of William and Mary in Williamsburg, nor is it known that he went abroad to study. But there is no doubt that he was well-educated and thoroughly versed in the polite accomplishments deemed so necessary for the sons of the Virginia gentry. Although Carter, in his diary, pays little heed to grammar, punctuation, or spelling, his letters show that he could write in as correct and polished an eighteenth century style as any of his fellow planters.<sup>8</sup>

In 1756, at the age of twenty-two, Robert Wormeley Carter married Winifred Travers Beale, a member of one of the leading families in Richmond County. From this marriage five children were born. Landon, the eldest, who inherited Sabine Hall, attended the College of William and Mary, served in the Second Virginia Regiment during the Revolution, and became a member of the Virginia House of Delegates. Another son, George, married his cousin, Sarah, the daughter of Edward Carter of Blenheim in Albermarle County. Carter's daughters married well and each brought with them a dowry of £1,000.<sup>9</sup> Elizabeth married Colonel Peter Presley Thornton, who died in 1781. The following year the recently bereaved widow married her cousin, Landon Carter of Cleve, and bore many children, the best-known of whom was St. Leger Landon Carter who, under the name of Nugator, published a volume of prose and poetry and contributed many articles to the *Southern Literary Messenger*. Fanny, another of Carter's daughters, married Thomas Ludwell Lee of Coton in Loudoun County, while the youngest child, Ann Beale, married her cousin, Charles Carter of Mount Atlas. It is to be noted that of Carter's five children, three married close relatives, an indication of the growing exclusiveness of the Carter clan and of the Virginia aristocracy.

Robert Wormeley Carter's life followed the usual pattern laid out

<sup>7</sup> Charles Carter to Landon Carter, March 31, 1765, in Carter Papers, Folder 2, William and Mary College Library.

<sup>8</sup> Only a few letters by or to Robert Wormeley Carter have been preserved. These are in the Carter Papers, William and Mary College Library.

<sup>9</sup> Thomas Ludwell Lee to Robert Wormeley Carter, March 24, 1787, in Carter Papers, Folder 11, William and Mary College Library; Will of Robert Wormeley Carter, Richmond County records, Will Book IX, p. 73.

for the sons of the planters. To gain the prerequisite experience for a seat in the House of Burgesses or the Council, the younger members of the ruling class were customarily appointed to positions of local importance. Carter's political career began with his appointment in about 1767 to the county court as a justice of the peace, an office he held almost continuously for the rest of his life. He gained further training in leadership as a member of the vestry of Lunenburg Parish in Richmond County. Elected a churchwarden in 1768, he was entrusted with the task of supervising the erection of a workhouse for the parish. Thus, by the time he had reached his thirty-fifth birthday, Carter had already become an important official in the life of the county.

Carter's political experience was gained in the years preceding the Revolution. From the very start he opposed the attempt by England to tax the colonies for the purpose of raising revenue to support an army in America. No doubt his father's views influenced him in this matter, but he went further than did Landon. The "cursed Stamp Act," as he called it, led to a well-organized opposition in Virginia which received its greatest impetus from the Westmoreland resolutions, passed at Leedstown on February 27, 1766. Carter was present at the meeting and his name is to be found among the distinguished men, headed by Richard Henry Lee, who signed the resolutions.<sup>10</sup>

It was not until 1769 that Robert Wormeley Carter entered the larger field of colonial politics. In that year he was elected to the House of Burgesses to fill the place of the late Captain John Woodbridge who had served with Landon Carter for many years. Sitting with Robert Wormeley was Francis Lightfoot Lee, also a delegate from Richmond County and a member of the House for the first time.<sup>11</sup> The two men were colleagues until the Revolution, when Lee was sent to Philadelphia, where he signed the Declaration of Independence.

Attending his first meeting as a member of the House, Carter was assigned a place on the committee of propositions and grievances.

<sup>10</sup> John P. Kennedy and Henry R. McIlwaine (eds.), *Journals of the House of Burgesses of Virginia*, 13 vols. (Richmond, 1905-1913), IV, lix ff.

<sup>11</sup> William G. and Mary N. Stanard (comps.), *The Colonial Virginia Register* (Albany, 1902), *passim*.

Serving on the same committee were an uncle and a cousin, both named Charles Carter, and Richard Lee, George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Edmund Pendleton, and others. This was probably the most important committee in the House, having power to consider all proposals and petitions that were submitted to the Assembly, and to send for persons, papers, and records to secure information in making its report to the House. At later sessions he was a member of the committee of privileges and elections, another important body in the lower house which had as its function the examination of all election returns and the consideration of all questions relating to elections and privileges.<sup>12</sup>

Carter was a member of the House of Burgesses continuously from 1769 to 1776. During this time he was active in that group of patriots who opposed the British scheme of taxation. In 1770 he signed a resolution urging the repeal of certain duties imposed by the Mother Country. The Tea Act led to the formation of an association, signed by 89 members of the House of Burgesses who met at the Raleigh Tavern on May 27, 1774, the day after Governor John Dunmore had dissolved the House. Robert Wormeley Carter was present at this meeting and signed the resolutions condemning the attack on Boston and the tax levied on tea. Three days later he, with 24 other burgesses, convened at the Raleigh and issued a call for the convention which elected delegates to the First Continental Congress.<sup>13</sup> In the ensuing election, the people supported this action and, in general, returned the personnel of the dissolved House. In Richmond County the freeholders chose Robert Wormeley Carter and Francis Lightfoot Lee to represent "their Sentiments relative to Associations against Exports & Imports to and from G. Britain."<sup>14</sup>

In the revolutionary conventions which met at Williamsburg and Richmond in 1775, Carter and Lee continued to represent their county. Apparently both were radicals in their politics. The latter was chosen

<sup>12</sup> Kennedy and McIlwaine (eds.), *Journals of the House of Burgesses*, I, 75, 76; II, 157, 170, 206; III, 222.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, I, xiii, II, xxvi ff.; *Virginia Gazette* (Purdie and Dixon edition), July 4, 1774.

<sup>14</sup> Entry of June 29, 1774.

delegate to the Continental Congress in 1775, while the former participated in the deliberations of the conventions and helped to carry on the war in Virginia.<sup>15</sup> In the election of delegates to the convention of May, 1776, however, a heated contest took place in Richmond County and, on the basis of purely personal considerations, both Carter and Lee were ousted by the electorate in favor of Charles McCarty and Hudson Muse.<sup>16</sup> Landon spoke caustically of the ingratitude of his countrymen, and especially of the two newly-elected members to the convention, whom he described as "a worthless impudent fellow and . . . a most silly, tho' good-natured fool," respectively.<sup>17</sup>

Carter's defeat for office did not cause him to turn from public service. He continued to serve as a justice of the peace and as a member of the vestry of Lunenburg Parish. He was appointed lieutenant of the Richmond County militia in 1776, and a colonel in the following year, although he did not engage in active military service. His son, Landon, recently returned from the College of William and Mary, served in the Second Virginia Regiment, Continental Line.<sup>18</sup>

In 1779 Robert Wormeley Carter returned to the political arena by campaigning successfully for election to the House of Delegates then meeting in Williamsburg. He represented his county again in the years 1781 and 1782, during which time he served once more on the committee of privileges and elections and the committee of propositions and grievances. Legislation dealing with the equal assessment of lands and the revision of the tax rate occupied most of his attention while he was in the legislature, and several bills for this purpose were introduced by him.<sup>19</sup> After 1782 Carter's name disappears from the official

<sup>15</sup> *The Proceedings of the Convention of Delegates Held at Richmond on March 20, 1775* (Richmond, 1816).

<sup>16</sup> Robert L. Hilldrup, *The Life and Times of Edmund Pendleton* (Chapel Hill, 1939), 102-104; Brant, *James Madison*, 197.

<sup>17</sup> *William and Mary College Quarterly*, Ser. 1, Vol. XVI (1907), 259.

<sup>18</sup> John H. Gwathmey, *Historical Register of Virginians in the Revolution, 1775-1783* (Richmond, 1938), *passim*.

<sup>19</sup> Earl G. Swem and John W. Williams (comps.), *Register of the General Assembly of Virginia, 1776-1918* (Richmond, 1918), *passim*; *Journal of the House of Delegates of the Commonwealth of Virginia, Sessions of 1779-1782* (Richmond, 1827-1828), *passim*.

records, and he retired from public life to devote himself to the multifarious affairs of plantation management.

Sabine Hall, on the Rappahannock, where Robert Wormeley Carter lived, was the most important part of his estate.<sup>20</sup> Built by Landon about 1730 on land given him by his father, and named in honor of the Roman poet, Horace, Sabine Hall was inherited by Robert Wormeley in 1779. Like most Virginia plantation houses, it is situated close to a river and has a land and water approach. Based on a simple rectangular plan, the house is two stories high and measures sixty by forty feet. Extending from the east and west sides are long, low wings, one of which was added recently. The south or land façade is broken by an impressive portico supported by four cypress columns, supposed to have been erected shortly after the Revolution, probably by Robert Wormeley Carter. The entire structure was originally of red brick, laid in Flemish bond. Surrounding the main house are dependent buildings which in Robert Wormeley's day were used for various domestic purposes. The interior of Sabine Hall is richly paneled and elaborately carved. Landon furnished the house in the best manner of his time and Robert Wormeley added much. Occasionally the latter employed William Buckland, the architect of Gunston Hall in Virginia and the Hammond-Harwood house in Maryland, to design a piece or draw a plan for him. "Buckland this day brought home my Book case," he wrote in 1766, "also put up the chimney piece of carved work . . . also a Plan of a House."<sup>21</sup>

Great houses like Sabine Hall were not a rarity in colonial Virginia; many of the planters of the period built homes equal to it in size and splendor. Invariably such manor houses were designated by name. Chantilly, Rosegill, Elsing Green, Mount Airy, and Marmion are indications of the nice care with which such names were chosen. It was customary to link the planter with the name of his home. Thus, Robert

<sup>20</sup> For a description of the house, see Edith T. Sale, *Interior of Virginia Houses of Colonial Times* (Richmond, 1927), 159-67; Robert A. Lancaster, *Historic Virginia Homes and Churches* (Philadelphia, 1915), 333-37. The house still stands and is in the possession of descendants of Robert Wormeley Carter.

<sup>21</sup> Entry of February 6, 1766.

Wormeley was known as Robert Wormeley Carter of Sabine Hall; the Councilor, his cousin, as Robert Carter of Nomini Hall; and John Tayloe as John Tayloe of Mount Airy. Often the name of the seat was so intimately associated with the owner that it was made a part of his name. Robert Wormeley, in his diary, refers to William Fitzhugh of Marmion as "Marmion Fitzhugh" and to his cousins Charles Carter of Corotoman and Landon Carter of Cleve as "Corotoman Carter" and "Cleve Carter."

Life at Sabine Hall was marked by a gracious style of living which expressed itself in an open-handed hospitality, frequent interchange of visits with friends and relatives, and numerous dinners, dances, and balls. The picture of the plantation as an isolated community, and the planter lying in wait for a traveler so that he might have company is certainly not borne out by Robert Wormeley Carter's diary. He neither lived in isolation nor lacked for company. As a matter of fact, Carter seems rarely to have remained at home for more than a few days at a time. When he was not entertaining his neighbors or busy with the operation of his large estate, he was most likely to be visiting with the Tayloes at Mount Airy, the Beverleys at Blandfield, the Lees at Stratford Hall and Lee Hall, or his Carter kinsmen at Corotoman and Cleve. Such social calls, unless in the neighborhood of Sabine Hall, usually lasted for several days. "Returned from Corotoman in Compa with Mr John Beale," Carter noted on one occasion, "where we spent a very agreeable week."<sup>22</sup> Sabine Hall was, in a sense, with Mount Airy and one or two other plantations, the social center of Richmond County.

At least once a year, usually in January, Sabine Hall was the scene of a great ball lasting for three days. Landon Carter wrote in 1770 that his "annual entertainment began on Monday . . . and held till Wednesday night, when, except one individual or two that retired sooner, things pleased me much, and, therefore, I will conclude they gave the same satisfaction to others."<sup>23</sup> At this affair, as well as others like it, there was much music and dancing. Vast quantities of food

<sup>22</sup> Entry of January 5, 1768.

<sup>23</sup> *William and Mary College Quarterly*, Ser. 1, Vol. XIII (1904), 46.

were consumed and the wine flowed freely. The Virginia gentleman, although he imbibed generously, knew his capacity. Frequent orders for liquor may be found in the letters of nearly all the planters, and Robert Wormeley Carter was no exception. "Yesterday got home a pipe of wine, a Cask of Molasses, 1 Cask rum, 1 Case gin,"<sup>24</sup> he wrote once, and noted later that he had borrowed two dozen bottles of Madeira from John Tayloe. The consumption of liquor, especially wine, in the Carter household is amazing by present standards. "My wine was broached about Christmas," Robert Wormeley wrote on February 16, 1792, and added that he had used to that day "5 dozen & five Bottles."<sup>25</sup> And yet, in his diary, one never comes across instances of drunkenness.

Hospitality at Sabine Hall included not only a well-laden table and a bottle of wine, but diversion in the field and the use of a horse as well. Carter mentions only twice the fact that he went hunting, but his casual references would indicate that he was at least familiar with, if not proficient at the sport. Hunting was the favorite pastime of many planters, and a few men of great wealth laid out deer parks near the manor house. The sport was predominantly a social event. "Went to hunting at Manokin with Coll. Tayloe & Mr Ball," wrote Carter, but added that they had had "no Sport."<sup>26</sup> Fox hunting really reached its highest development in the nineteenth century, but already the sport had become well established. George Washington frequently refers to hunting the fox, and Carter on one occasion speaks of "being upwards of 4 hours on a Fox chase."<sup>27</sup>

Robert Wormeley Carter was an enthusiastic turfman and maintained a stable of race horses at Sabine Hall. In this he was not alone, for many planters shared his love for the sport and bred their own horses or imported them. Carter, at different times, mentions by name at least a dozen horses belonging to him, some of them well-known

<sup>24</sup> Entry of January 4, 1792.

<sup>25</sup> Entry of February 16, 1792.

<sup>26</sup> Entry of January 31, 1766.

<sup>27</sup> Entry of April 19, 1792.

racers of their day. Like most breeders, he entered his horses in the races held regularly at Williamsburg, Fredericksburg, and Tappahannock (Hobbe's Hole), where they met the best competition in America. For example, in 1768 he wrote that he had paid John Tayloe—probably the most prominent turfman in colonial American—£3 for his subscription to the Newmarket purse, but failed to specify which of his horses ran. Carter belonged to the Fredericksburg Jockey Club, which included most of the sportsmen of the Northern Neck, and when a similar organization was founded in Tappahannock in 1796 he was elected its first president.<sup>28</sup>

Carter's journal is probably most revealing in making clear the extent to which he gambled. He seems to have been an inveterate cardplayer, and was always willing to back his opinion on a horse race or a cock fight. The Virginia planters, as gentlemen do in every age, included gambling among the polite diversions. George Washington, for example, considered gambling a normal pastime and kept a record in his ledger book of his gains and losses at games of chance.<sup>29</sup> However, it was only rarely, as in the case of William Byrd III of Westover, that a man of means found himself faced with disaster because of a fondness for Dame Fortune.

As a devotee of the race track, Carter won and lost heavily on horses. In the races held at Fredericksburg in 1774 he won £25 from Alexander Spotswood, but lost £10 to Peter Thornton and another £20 to Benjamin Grymes. Only twice did he attend a cock fight, once at Tappahannock, and again at Rocky Ridge in Chesterfield County. On the latter occasion he lost over £24, "pretty considerable considering my situation & the present scarcity of cash," he lamented.<sup>30</sup>

Perhaps one of the most interesting pages of Robert Wormeley Carter's diary is a debit and credit sheet entitled "Sporting for 1768," in which he lists all his gains and losses during that year, and emerges

<sup>28</sup> *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* (Richmond, 1893- ), XXXVII (1929), 55.

<sup>29</sup> John C. Fitzpatrick (ed.), *The Diaries of George Washington, 1748-1799*, 4 vols. (Boston, 1925), I, 246.

<sup>30</sup> Entry of May 7, 1768.



with over £5 on the credit side of the ledger.<sup>31</sup> He was not always so fortunate, however, and on one occasion after returning from Williamsburg where he had been attending a meeting of the House of Burgesses, he wrote that "this trip cost me at least 500£ fatal effects of gaming, I am now severely doing penance, from the Behaviour and oburgations of my Father & Wife; who from my Countenance conclude I have lost much money; cursed folly to throw myself into such difficulties in these worst of times."<sup>32</sup> This experience apparently had little effect upon him, for he continued to gamble as frequently as before.

Almost all the visitors who came to Sabine Hall found ready diversion in games of whist, tredrille, or cribbage. Although he frequently played with his sons, Landon Carter disliked their gambling habits and expressed himself, characteristically, in fluent words and in no uncertain terms. To him the gaming table was the "suburbs of Hell," and "every Gamester void of friendship, & all the other virtues wch shd ever distinguish the Gentleman."<sup>33</sup>

One of Robert Wormeley's most frequent partners at the card table, and a regular visitor at Sabine Hall, was the minister of Lunenburg Parish, the Reverend Isaac William Giberne. Thought to be a nephew of the Bishop of Durham, Giberne had married into the Fauntleroy family and occupied a prominent position in Richmond County. He was a man of great personal charm and social attainments who kept open house at his plantation, Belle Ville. His wit was so excellent as to move Richard Henry Lee to remark that he would not exchange an hour of the minister's facetiousness "for an age of Congress wisdom."<sup>34</sup> Giberne's favorite diversion was gambling, and Landon Carter wrote of him that "It is a shame this sensible Parson should be such a decoy to youths as he is. But he loves cards & their concomitants."<sup>35</sup>

<sup>31</sup> Last page of Diary for 1768.

<sup>32</sup> Entry of June 16, 1774.

<sup>33</sup> *William and Mary College Quarterly*, Ser. 1, Vol. XVI (1907), 262.

<sup>34</sup> James C. Ballagh (ed.), *The Letters of Richard Henry Lee*, 2 vols. (New York, 1911-1914), II, 51.

<sup>35</sup> *William and Mary College Quarterly*, Ser. 1, Vol. XVI (1907), 155.

If Landon found cause to grumble at the gambling of Robert Wormeley, the latter had reason enough in later life to bemoan a similar failing on the part of his son, George, who once lost almost £2,000. Robert Wormeley agreed to pay the debt at the rate of £100 a year, but rebelled against his son's extravagance with poetic fervor:

Tho' Children as their years increase,  
Increase our cares & spoil our peace  
Parental love can never cease  
But ever will remain.<sup>36</sup>

In his relations with his family and his fellow-man, Robert Wormeley Carter endeavored to conduct himself with dignity and courtesy. Good breeding, he knew, was the hallmark of the gentleman, and a knowledge of the social graces and pleasing conversation the measure of his social position. Thus, when Carter had to pay a fine for giving vent to his temper at a meeting of the county court, he wrote that he was ashamed of himself for swearing and hoped piously that God would pardon him for departing from the dignified conduct befitting his station. Courage and bravery, as well as fortitude, were virtues much admired by the Virginia gentleman. Carter, for example, held a low opinion of Dr. Nicholas Flood, yet spoke highly of him after his death for "he had made so good an Exit."<sup>37</sup> And Landon Carter noted of the worthy doctor that much was said of his goodness because on his deathbed "he never sighed nor groaned."<sup>38</sup>

Obviously the fine houses of Tidewater Virginia and the social life that centered about them was possible only to those of large means. No family had been more successful in reaping the ripe fruits of Virginia's abundant store than had the Carters, and Robert Wormeley inherited his fair share of worldly goods. While his father was still living he had been given outright 1,000 acres in Stafford and 1,225 in Richmond County.<sup>39</sup> His two brothers, Landon and John, received 4,400 acres each in 1761, and at their father's death eighteen years later an addi-

<sup>36</sup> Entry of July 1, 1792.

<sup>37</sup> Entry of March 18, 1776.

<sup>38</sup> *William and Mary College Quarterly*, Ser. 1, Vol. XVI (1907), 257.

<sup>39</sup> Letter of Robert Wormeley Carter, April 5, 1766, in Carter Papers, Folder 19, William and Mary College Library.

tional amount of land which enabled them to live in the style to which they were accustomed.

The bulk of the estate of the elder Landon Carter was inherited by Robert Wormeley. According to the terms of the will he came into possession of land in a dozen counties stretching from Chesapeake Bay to the Shenandoah Valley, as well as lots in Williamsburg.<sup>40</sup> Later he acquired a small property from Richard Neale, and lots in Richmond won in Byrd's lottery. The precise extent of his holdings cannot be determined, but it must have been well over 50,000 acres.<sup>41</sup>

The possession of such a large estate involved a problem of no mean proportion. Obviously, so much land could not be utilized profitably by one man, since equipment and labor were too costly. The alternative was to place under cultivation only a part of his holdings, and to lease the remainder to tenants. This seems to have been the method adopted by Robert Wormeley Carter as well as by other large landed proprietors.

In his diary, Carter notes frequent payments, usually in crop tobacco, made to him by his tenants. Most of his land in the western counties, where he held large and undeveloped tracts, was utilized in this fashion. One tract of almost 9,000 acres in Frederick County, for example, was converted into 51 lots, and another, valued at £8,000, on the Opequon River was leased to fifteen tenants. Land on his "Chenandoa tract" rented for about £10 per hundred acres in 1795.<sup>42</sup> His income from this source, therefore, must have been a handsome one.

The collection of rents from lands situated a long distance from Sabine Hall was not easy. Many of Carter's tenants were frequently in arrears, and sometimes he was forced to make the long and costly trip to the Valley himself. In 1784 he journeyed to the Shenandoah to collect payments due him and was successful in securing about £60,

<sup>40</sup> The will of Landon Carter is in the Richmond County records at Warsaw. It has been reprinted in part in the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, XXIX (1921), 361.

<sup>41</sup> See Landon and Robert Wormeley Carter's letters in Carter Papers, Folder 19, William and Mary College Library.

<sup>42</sup> Carter Papers, Folder 13, William and Mary College Library; Will of Robert Wormeley Carter, Richmond County records, Will Book IX, p. 73.

but noted that he had had to pay out about half that amount for expenses. Usually, however, he did not attend to this business himself but left the matter to agents residing in the neighborhood. Leonard Hill at one time represented Carter's interests in the Shenandoah region, and for many years John Shearman Woodcock was the regular agent in Frederick County.

The land which Carter utilized in the production of crops was divided into operating units, spoken of as quarters or plantations. At one time he had as many as ten such units, the chief of which was Sabine Hall. Each of the plantations had its own buildings and was fully equipped with stock and cattle. On his quarter in Stafford County, for example, Carter built one dwelling house and ten other buildings, and in 1768 he noted the construction at Ring's Neck plantation of two Negro quarters, a corn house, and a house for the overseer. His supply of cattle was ample for his needs. At Mangorike and Fork, two of his quarters, he had close to 150 cows, oxen, and steers, and in his tax report for 1784 he noted in Richmond County alone, 183 head of cattle and 43 horses.

To direct the activities of each unit, Carter appointed an overseer, responsible only to him. These men were hired on an annual basis and received either a share of the crop or a stipulated salary. When their remuneration was in produce, it was usually fixed at from seven to ten per cent of everything grown on the land, in addition to certain perquisites. "Jesse Hill came from taking a view of my Aquia Quarter," Carter wrote on October 26, 1776. "I agreed with him to be my overseer next year for a tenth part of everything planted or sown on the Plantation after deducting the seed; I am to pay his levy, but no poll tax, allow 400 Wt meat."<sup>43</sup> When an overseer preferred a salary to a share of the crop, Carter was perfectly willing to accommodate him. The salary varied from £10 to £50, with perquisites, depending upon the plantation involved and the experience of the overseer. George Habron, for example, first agreed to accept one-seventh of the crop, but later said that he preferred an annual wage which was fixed

<sup>43</sup> Entry of October 26, 1776.

at £11, with an allowance of meat. On the other hand, Solomon Abraham received much greater consideration. "This day agreed with Solomon Abrams as an Overseers," Carter wrote; "he is to be moved at my Expence to come by News years day at furthest; he is to have 600 lbs pork, 10 barrells corn; he is to overlook my Estate's called Mangorike & Fork and I am to give him a Salary of 50£."<sup>44</sup>

The men who managed Carter's plantations did not belong to the planter class. George Habron, John Reynolds, Jesse Hill, George Purcel, and William Davis are not associated with the first families of Virginia. However, Carter's diary, like that of his father, reveals the significant fact that sometimes a member of the planter class, for one reason or another, acted in the capacity of an overseer. "Dined at Mt Airy with Col. Lee & Mr Page," Carter wrote, "agreed to part with Mr. Hamilton at the instance of Col. Tayloe's Exrs who employed him to overlook the [illegible] Estate."<sup>45</sup> The Mr. Hamilton referred to was Robert, the son of Gilbert Hamilton, sheriff of Richmond County. Again, Carter noted that he had paid Robert Thornton for acting as overseer for him at one of his plantations.

An interesting aspect of plantation management shown in Robert Wormeley Carter's journal is the extent to which white artisans, usually indentured servants, were employed by the planters at this late period. At various times John Tayloe's weaver and Colonel Fauntleroy's shoemaker did work for Carter. Finding such a system cumbersome as well as costly, Carter purchased for £25 a weaver, William McKaway by name, whom he sent to Mount Airy for instruction. In 1769 McKaway produced over 6,000 yards of cloth, which Carter found inadequate in view of the original investment. "I am well convinced," he wrote, "there is nothing to be made by weaving at 5d coarse & fine; I shall therefore only carry it on for the conveniency of getting my own work done."<sup>46</sup> Carter also employed free white artisans, and in his journal speaks of shoemakers, weavers, barbers, carpenters, and bricklayers

<sup>44</sup> Entry of August 9, 1792.

<sup>45</sup> Entry of June 20, 1785.

<sup>46</sup> Undated entry in Diary for 1769.

who lived at Tappahannock and did work for the planters in the neighborhood.

Negroes, of course, constituted the bulk of Robert Wormeley Carter's labor supply. From his father he inherited well over 200 slaves,<sup>47</sup> and this number was increased through the years by the high birth rate prevalent among the blacks. Carter, therefore, rarely found it necessary to buy additional slaves. When he did it was usually one who had been specially trained as an artisan. On December 6, 1784, he noted in his diary that he had bought a blacksmith, General Surennah. Apparently he was averse to separating Surennah from his wife, for he also purchased her, as well as her three children, paying a total of £420 for the entire family. More frequently Carter sold slaves, and on one occasion advertised in the *Virginia Gazette* twenty young Negroes for sale.<sup>48</sup>

The Negroes on Carter's plantation were used mostly for work in the fields, or in some capacity about the house. A number of them were trained for special work, however, and labored by the side of the white artisan. In the Diary for 1774 Carter wrote that he had placed Boy Billy under John Guthrie, who was to "learn him to make wheels."<sup>49</sup> At other times he speaks of Negro blacksmiths, bricklayers, and carpenters.

Carter commonly raised three major crops on his plantations, tobacco, corn, and wheat. The first, of course, was the most important, since it was cultivated as a money crop. With the income derived from the sale of tobacco Carter could purchase supplies and household goods. Since cash was scarce, tobacco notes could also be used to pay debts and to meet the obligations of church and state. Carter's diary provides a clue to the quantity of tobacco produced by a large planter. Between 1757 and 1773 he consigned 72 hogsheads to a single firm, for which he received an average price of £9 per hogshead. In 1768 he shipped 16 hogsheads to England, and in 1783, on five of his plan-

<sup>47</sup> Inventory of the estate of Landon Carter, in Carter Papers, Folder 3, William and Mary College Library.

<sup>48</sup> *Virginia Gazette* (Dixon and Hunter edition), December 26, 1777.

<sup>49</sup> Entry of December 1, 1774.

tations, he produced 36 hogsheads. The total amount of tobacco grown on Robert Wormeley's plantations must have been considerable.

Carter raised corn in large quantities, mainly for the purpose of feeding his slaves and cattle, and his journal provides a clear picture of his extensive production of this crop. On April 1, 1768, he wrote that he had produced 605 bushels of corn that year, and that at Hickory Thicket plantation, alone, 786 pecks had been consumed. The average yield of corn at that quarter he computed to be close to 700 pecks. The corn raised at his other plantations was proportionately as large.

Carter did not cultivate wheat to any large extent since he did not use it as a food for the Negroes. He felt, however, that its effect on the soil was beneficial and any surplus could be disposed of easily. "Sawney informed me he had cleaned and measured 83 bush. wheat . . . 25 delivered to Capt. Williamson Ball," he wrote. "I do not believe I shall double the seed sown but must continue on, as the straw & Chaff is serviceable; and my land is improved."<sup>50</sup> Although Carter rarely mentioned the deterioration of the soil and improved methods of cultivation, he nevertheless showed an interest in scientific agriculture. At various times he made comments about the productivity of the land which indicate that he was keenly aware of the problem. He regularly consulted the *Virginia Almanac*—in which he kept his diary for several years<sup>51</sup>—replete with curious and valuable information useful to planters, and was so impressed with the writings of Arthur Young that he copied into his journal extracts from Young's *Eastern Tour*.<sup>52</sup>

Most of Carter's tobacco was shipped to British factors who, in turn, sent him the various supplies required for his plantations. This system of marketing was productive of certain evils, the chief of which was the habit of the planter to fall into debt to the merchant. Carter in 1768 wrote that he owed the firm of James Russell in London £110 and

<sup>50</sup> Entry of August 31, 1777.

<sup>51</sup> Four of Robert Wormeley Carter's diaries are written in the alternating blank pages of the *Virginia Almanack*. No doubt other of his diaries which have been lost were also entered in this publication. George Washington kept his diary for many years in the *Virginia Almanack*, as did Thomas Jefferson, Landon Carter, John Blair, John Page, and others.

<sup>52</sup> *Diary for 1785.*

John Backhouse of Liverpool £165. In fifteen years he sent the latter tobacco valued at over £600, and still remained indebted to him, thus indicating the extent to which he purchased goods from abroad. After the Revolution, although he disposed of more and more tobacco in Virginia, Carter continued his relations with British mercantile houses. He favored the Liverpool market, apparently, and sent to James Maury, merchant and later first American consul there, regular shipments of tobacco.

Besides his relations with British factors, Carter had numerous connections with local merchants. In Tappahannock his largest account was with Archibald Ritchie, but he also had dealings with Andrew Crawford, resident factor for the Glasgow house of Thomas Ritchie and Company. At Dumfries and Fredericksburg were a number of merchants from whom he purchased supplies, and at Falmouth both Dekar Thompson and Edward Moore regularly received orders from him. Some of these men represented Scotch firms and others acted independently. In either case, after the middle of the eighteenth century, they absorbed more and more of the business of the planters whose ordinary needs they could meet easily and with little delay. Carter's diary shows the part played by such merchants in the plantation economy and illuminates an aspect of Virginia's history which is often neglected.

The journal of Robert Wormeley Carter is an important contribution to the social history of the Old Dominion. Dealing with a period when Virginia society had attained a high level of order and stability, the diary derives its chief value from the picture it presents of that small and aristocratic class which controlled the life of the colony. The evidence in Carter's journal reveals him to have been a man of broad interests and varied activities and goes far toward disproving the popular notion that the planter lived in ease and indolence and devoted himself exclusively to pleasurable pursuits. Carter, as has been seen, was a hard working man, busy with the many details that enter into the successful operation of a complex business. He produced tobacco, corn, wheat, and other crops, some of which were shipped abroad, some con-



sumed on the plantation, and others disposed of in a local market. Possessing large and undeveloped tracts, in addition to numerous plantations, he derived a considerable income in rents from tenants who leased his land. Despite the fact that the management of his estate consumed much of his energies, Carter found time to engage in politics, to entertain lavishly, and to participate in the many social diversions of his day. He was away from home much of the time, on pleasure and business trips, and his diary acquires an added value from his references to the places he visited and the people he met. As a record of the activities of a planter of wide means and vast resources and as a source for the study of Virginia society during the latter half of the eighteenth century, his diary is a significant and valuable document.

# The Establishment of the Alabama Railroad Commission

BY ALLEN J. GOING

In state as well as in national politics, the attempt to regulate common carriers was one of the most important and most controversial problems of the post-Civil War period.<sup>1</sup> Although there had been some effort toward control by individual states before the war, the movement for effective regulation through state railroad commissions did not gain real headway until the decade of the 1870's. The creation and work of these state commissions undoubtedly accelerated the movement toward national regulation, especially after the obvious failure of state boards in their attempts to regulate interstate traffic.

Railroad commissions with fairly strong powers of control arose in the western and southern states in the 1870's and the 1880's.<sup>2</sup> The Alabama commission, created by statute in 1881, affords a good example of the origin and work of these boards. The law establishing the Alabama commission borrowed some features from laws in other states, introduced some new features, and in turn served as a model for later commission laws in other states.<sup>3</sup>

Railroads had played a prominent part in Alabama politics for many years. Controversies over them had not been concerned with the ques-

<sup>1</sup> A grant from the University of Alabama Research Fund assisted in the collection of material for this article.

<sup>2</sup> For general discussions of state railroad commissions, see the following: Henry S. Haines, *Restrictive Railway Legislation* (New York, 1906); Balthasar H. Meyer, *Railway Legislation in the United States* (New York, 1903); State Regulation of Railroads, Appendix G, part IV, of the Report of the Interstate Commerce Commission, December 15, 1902, in *House Documents*, 58 Cong., 2 Sess., No. 253, part V; Report of the Cullom Committee, January 18, 1886, in *Senate Reports*, 49 Cong., 1 Sess., No. 46 (2 vols.), I, 63-137.

<sup>3</sup> Maxwell Ferguson, *State Regulation of Railroads in the South* (New York, 1916), 129-31.

tion of regulation but with the issue of state aid for the construction and extension of the roads so necessary to the prosperity of the state.<sup>4</sup> Early in the decade 1870-1880, however, there began to appear certain evidences of a desire to regulate by law these recipients of public funds and credit. Such sentiment increased when the public realized that the railroads had taken advantage of the confused condition of the state government during Reconstruction and had contributed toward bringing the state to the verge of bankruptcy by profligate use of state funds and credit. Criticisms of railroad monopolies found their way into the public press, but such denunciations usually applied to railroads in general or to lines outside of the state.<sup>5</sup> Alabama as yet was too vitally concerned with the political problems of Reconstruction and too anxious for further railroad development to make any concerted attack on its own local railroad lines.

In the country as a whole, leadership of the railroad regulation movement during the 1870's was assumed by the Patrons of Husbandry (the National Grange). Although the Grange developed a fairly strong organization in Alabama, it is difficult to ascertain how much influence the members wielded in encouraging and proposing regulatory legislation.<sup>6</sup> Like the press and the general public, members of the Grange were torn between a desire for better transportation facilities and a desire to follow the precedent set by similar organizations in the West in furthering railroad regulation.<sup>7</sup> The second annual session of the Alabama State Grange indefinitely postponed action on a resolution favoring direct state legislation on passenger and freight tariffs and

<sup>4</sup> For the story of Alabama's aid to railroads during this period, see Walter L. Fleming, *Civil War and Reconstruction in Alabama* (New York, 1905), 587-604; Albert B. Moore, "Railroad Building in Alabama during the Reconstruction Period," in *Journal of Southern History* (Baton Rouge, 1935- ), I (1935), 421-41.

<sup>5</sup> *Tusculumbia North Alabamian*, September 28, 1875; *Mobile Tribune*, February 16, 1875; *Mobile Daily Register*, February 24, 1875; *Mobile Weekly Register*, August 23, 1873.

<sup>6</sup> There have been no detailed studies of Grange activities in Alabama. Some information on the subject can be found in John B. Clark, *Populism in Alabama* (Auburn, Ala., 1927), 51-59.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 38, 40; Thomas M. Owen, *History of Alabama and Dictionary of Alabama Biography*, 4 vols. (Chicago, 1921), I, 667.

on one demanding an outright reduction of freight rates.<sup>8</sup> The *Southern Plantation*, official organ of the State Grange, reflected no anti-railroad sentiment.<sup>9</sup>

The very fact that such proposals came to light in a state Grange convention, however, indicates that some Grangers favored railroad regulation. The most ardent newspaper supporter of the Grange, although not advocating outright regulation, sometimes warned the public in strong language against the "overweening power of railroad corporations."<sup>10</sup> Evidently most of the sentiment for regulatory legislation existed in local Granges and did not reach the proportions of a statewide movement.

Prior to the establishment of the Alabama Railroad Commission in 1881, public sentiment for regulation brought about some tangible results in the form of special legislative acts. The first such act applying to more than one road came in connection with the extension of state aid and credit to proposed railroad lines.<sup>11</sup> The state aid act of 1867 contained no definite requirements concerning rates, but it did provide for loose supervision by the state, annual reports to the governor, and state representation on the board of directors of each road.<sup>12</sup> The "Omnibus Railroad Bill" of 1870, passed during the first Radical Republican administration, went further in its attempt to regulate charges on railroads receiving benefits under the act. It limited the passenger rates on the roads affected to four cents per mile and prohibited local freight charges in excess of twenty-five per cent above through freight tariffs.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>8</sup> *Proceedings of the State Grange of the Patrons of Husbandry of Alabama* (Montgomery, 1874), 16, 26.

<sup>9</sup> The *Southern Plantation* was published at Montgomery. Incomplete files, 1875-1877, are in the Alabama Department of Archives and History, Montgomery.

<sup>10</sup> Selma *Southern Argus*, December 29, 1876, September 7, 1877.

<sup>11</sup> Previous to this, the only checks exercised by the state over railroads were embodied in the railroad charters, many of which contained certain regulatory features. Owen, *History of Alabama*, II, 1155; Albert B. Moore, *History of Alabama* (University, Ala., 1934), 317-18. For a summary of these charters, see *Alabama Railroad Commission Report*, 1881, pp. 18-26.

<sup>12</sup> Alabama Legislature, *Acts*, 1886-1887, p. 686; *Alabama Railroad Commission Report*, 1881, pp. 26-27.

<sup>13</sup> Alabama Legislature, *Acts*, 1869-1870, p. 157.

The first regulatory law applying to all railroads in the state appeared on the statute books in 1873. The bill as introduced would have prohibited railroads from making a greater charge for local than for through freight, but the act as finally passed limited passenger fares to five cents per mile and allowed a maximum rate of fifty per cent more on local than on through freight.<sup>14</sup> A possible explanation of the difference between the original bill and the final act is indicated in the report of a joint committee of the legislature which was appointed to confer with the railroad companies concerning the proposed legislation. Although it admitted that railroads, as creatures of the legislature, should not be permitted to use their power to the hurt of any of the people, the committee declared: "Sound policy requires that legislation should be such as to protect it [railway system] in its legitimate employment, and not to force it into a course of management that would jeopard its interests."<sup>15</sup>

This legislation was given only passing notice by the press<sup>16</sup> and it seems to have aroused little excitement among the people. Apparently the original act was not rigorously enforced, since a subsequent act, passed in 1875, stated that any railroad company or employee violating the law of 1873 would be guilty of a misdemeanor, and provided for fines ranging from \$100 to \$500.<sup>17</sup> After the establishment of the state railroad commission the regulatory law of 1873 was repealed.<sup>18</sup>

The election of 1874 placed the Democrats in control of all branches of the state government for the first time since 1867. In the convention of 1875, which completely revised the constitution, strong sentiments were expressed for the regulation of railroads. From the very first the convention showed hostility to the Republican policy of giving special encouragement to the commercial and industrial life of the state. The

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, 1872-1873, p. 62; Owen, *History of Alabama*, II, 1173.

<sup>15</sup> Alabama Legislature, *Senate Journal*, 1872-1873, p. 385.

<sup>16</sup> *Mobile Daily Register*, April 4, 1873.

<sup>17</sup> Alabama Legislature, *Acts*, 1874-1875, p. 243.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, 1880-1881, p. 35. For judicial interpretation of the act of 1873, see the following cases: *State ex rel Harrell v. Mobile and Montgomery Railway Co.* (1887), 59 Ala. 321; *Mobile and Montgomery Railway Co. v. Steiner, McGehee & Co.* (1878), 61 Ala. 559.

bankrupt condition of the state government made such a position logical; extension of monetary aid was out of the question. Almost without opposition, two sections affecting railroads became part of the new constitution: one prohibiting state financial aid to a corporation and the other prohibiting the exemption of any corporation from payment of state taxes.<sup>19</sup>

Although the convention eliminated some of the more radical proposals for regulation, it did adopt a general statement which said: "The General Assembly shall pass laws to correct abuses and prevent unjust discrimination and extortion in the rates of freight and passenger tariffs on railroads, canals and rivers in this state." The final document also contained certain minor provisions concerning interchange of freight and passengers and the granting of passes.<sup>20</sup> Thus the new constitution recognized the need for regulatory legislation, but left to the legislature itself the task of formulating specific laws. In its first three sessions under the new constitution, however, the legislature failed to agree on any railroad policy.<sup>21</sup> Governor George S. Houston, a railroad attorney and stockholder, naturally did not include railroad regulation in his recommendations to the legislature.<sup>22</sup>

In spite of the absence of official action in the 1870's,<sup>23</sup> there is evidence of continued popular resentment against some railroad practices. Petitions to the legislature and letters in newspapers demonstrated dis-

<sup>19</sup> Alabama Constitution of 1875, Art. IV, sec. 54, Art. XI, sec. 6.

<sup>20</sup> *Journal of the Constitutional Convention of 1875* [of Alabama], 134-35; Alabama Constitution of 1875, Art. XIII, secs. 21-23; *Mobile Daily Register*, October 1, 3, 1875.

<sup>21</sup> The session of 1876-1877, the "Granger Legislature," made a number of futile attempts to pass regulatory laws. Alabama Legislature, *House Journal*, 579, 738; *Senate Journal*, 247-50.

<sup>22</sup> Ethel Armes, *The Story of Coal and Iron in Alabama* (Birmingham, 1910), 104, 245.

<sup>23</sup> Evidently there were no attempts prior to 1880 to establish a commission form of regulation. In 1873 the senate passed a bill for the appointment of a railroad commissioner. Alabama Legislature, *Senate Journal*, 1872-1873, pp. 208, 519. One writer has considered this an attempt to establish a regulatory officer. Ferguson, *Regulation of Railroads in the South*, 128. This assumption is not justified, since the principal duties of such an officer would have involved no questions of rates or regulation, but merely the collection of statistics for those roads receiving state aid. *Mobile Weekly Register*, April 12, 1873. Governor David P. Lewis recommended this same measure, but the lower house defeated it. Alabama Legislature, *House Journal*, 1873, pp. 12, 226.

satisfaction with the existing situation.<sup>24</sup> By 1880 this sentiment had reached such a pitch that legislation in some form was imperative. Reflecting this sentiment, Governor Rufus W. Cobb, in his message of November 9, 1880, said that the demand for such action was so general and pressing that the legislators must not fail to give it their earnest and serious consideration.<sup>25</sup> Such an attitude did not represent a purely personal opinion, for Governor Cobb was interested in and friendly to the Louisville and Nashville Railroad, just as Governor Houston had been.<sup>26</sup>

The chief Democratic papers of the state reflected the popular sentiment through editorials and correspondents' letters. As early as February, 1880, the *Montgomery Advertiser* declared that some railroad legislation must be considered,<sup>27</sup> and in November the *Mobile Register* said that from every side came "the cry of an oppressed people against the arbitrary rule of the great railroad corporations."<sup>28</sup> Even the State Bar Association recommended a railroad commission composed of "discreet citizens."<sup>29</sup> The question did not, however, become a partisan issue. The Greenback-Labor party, which constituted the strongest opposition to the Democrats in state politics at the time, took no decided stand on the question of railroad regulation. The *Huntsville Advocate*, the chief Greenback-Labor paper, did occasionally print protests from farmers who complained that they were being "gouged and fleeced" by railroads.<sup>30</sup>

This expression of opinion on the necessity of some type of control might have been a continuation of earlier regulatory efforts. Now, however, urban interests, particularly merchants, were joining in the

<sup>24</sup> See petition from citizens of Butler County, in Alabama Legislature, *Senate Journal*, 1878-1879, p. 559; Selma *Southern Argus*, October 17, 1879; *Montgomery Advertiser*, March 26, 1879.

<sup>25</sup> Alabama Legislature, *House Journal*, 1880-1881, p. 30.

<sup>26</sup> Cobb was local attorney for the Louisville and Nashville Railroad and his iron works at Helena were located along its line. Armes, *Coal and Iron in Alabama*, 17, 147; Owen, *History of Alabama*, III, 347.

<sup>27</sup> *Montgomery Advertiser*, February 22, 1880.

<sup>28</sup> *Mobile Daily Register*, November 2, 1880.

<sup>29</sup> *Proceedings of the Alabama State Bar Association* (Montgomery, 1880), 127.

<sup>30</sup> See, for example, *Huntsville Advocate*, December 29, 1880.

demand. Such men as Daniel S. Troy, an influential political and business figure of Montgomery, vociferously called for regulation. Just before the legislature met in November, 1880, Colonel Troy published a lengthy communication outlining railroad legislation substantially the same as that adopted some months later.<sup>31</sup> In the years immediately following the Civil War, merchants and bankers had generally favored and promoted local railroad projects and had opposed any hampering restrictions. But during the seven years following the panic of 1873 the economic picture had altered. Practically no new lines had been built in Alabama,<sup>32</sup> and the existing ones were falling under the control of capital outside of the state.<sup>33</sup> The system of pooling interests in order to avoid competition and low rates had begun to cross state lines in the South and was causing the same popular resentment which it aroused in other sections of the country.

Among other things, the merchants and shippers feared that points in Alabama might be discriminated against in favor of points outside of the state. A committee of the State Bar Association voiced this feeling when it said: "These corporations [railroads] do not appear to be amenable to the law of competition. . . . If at any time dangerous competition is established between rival lines, the struggle is settled by direct consolidation of the rival corporations. . . . All this is the more striking and dangerous in states like Alabama, of limited capital, when capitalists come from other States and countries and obtain the control of its railroads."<sup>34</sup> Walter L. Bragg, one of Alabama's outstanding leaders in the postwar period and first president of the state

<sup>31</sup> Daniel S. Troy, *Proposed Railroad Legislation* (Montgomery, 1880[?]); also reprinted in *Montgomery Advertiser*, October 2, 3, 1880. Troy was president of the Alabama Fertilizer Company and was interested in a number of projects to develop the mineral resources of the Birmingham area. Owen, *History of Alabama*, III, 1686; Armes, *Coal and Iron in Alabama*, 203.

<sup>32</sup> In the six-year period from the end of 1868 to the end of 1874, nine hundred twenty-nine miles of road were constructed in the state, while during a similar period between 1874 and 1880 only sixty-one miles were constructed. Henry V. Poor (ed.), *Manual of the Railroads of the United States*, 1881, v; 1885, xiv.

<sup>33</sup> John W. Dubose, "Forty Years of Alabama History" (Unpublished manuscript in Alabama Department of Archives and History, Montgomery), 1265.

<sup>34</sup> *Proceedings of the Alabama State Bar Association*, 1880, p. 126.



railroad commission, expressed himself in a similar vein. "The greatest difficulty I have found with the railroads of Alabama," he said, "is the singular want of competition. . . . I am speaking of the pernicious effect of running a system like the Louisville & Nashville in this State . . . which drains but does not develop and build up business in this State along [its] lines."<sup>35</sup>

Some of the Alabama roads had been in the hands of outside capital for a number of years, and others were being consolidated rapidly in the hands of absentee owners. Since 1877 the Alabama and Chattanooga, reorganized as the Alabama Great Southern, had been in the hands of English capital.<sup>36</sup> The East Tennessee, Virginia, and Georgia was rapidly acquiring ownership or control of a number of important state lines. In 1877 it leased the Memphis and Charleston, the only east-west line serving northern Alabama; four years later it purchased the Selma, Rome and Dalton, one of Alabama's oldest lines, and in 1882, the Alabama Central, connecting Selma with Meridian, Mississippi, was brought into the system.<sup>37</sup> During this same period the Georgia railroads rapidly obtained control of the important lines in eastern Alabama. The Central Railroad Company of Georgia purchased the Western Railroad of Alabama in 1875 and the Montgomery and Eufaula in 1879.<sup>38</sup> These two lines, with such smaller ones as the Columbus and Western and the Mobile and Girard, formed important feeders to the Georgia system.

The chief threat from out-of-state corporations came from the Louisville and Nashville Railroad Company. With the turn of the decade this road undertook a program of extensive expansion; during the year 1880 alone it acquired control, by purchase or otherwise, of 1,206 miles of road, making a total of 2,355 miles operated.<sup>39</sup> The Louisville and

<sup>35</sup> Walter L. Bragg, *Speech before the Senate Judiciary Committee* (Montgomery, 1884), 2, 5.

<sup>36</sup> Owen, *History of Alabama*, I, 509-10; *Poor's Manual*, 1880, p. 552; 1885, pp. 494-95.

<sup>37</sup> Owen, *History of Alabama*, I, 509-10, 512; *Poor's Manual*, 1880, p. 493; 1884, p. 490.

<sup>38</sup> Owen, *History of Alabama*, I, 218; *Poor's Manual*, 1880, p. 550.

<sup>39</sup> *Poor's Manual*, 1880, p. 465; "Annual Report of the L & N Railroad," in *Commercial and Financial Chronicle* (New York, 1865- ), XXXI (1880) 403-404.

Nashville had been operating for some time both the Nashville and Decatur and the South and North Alabama roads. In January, 1880, it acquired the Mobile and Montgomery and the Mobile-New Orleans roads, thereby making a complete link between Louisville and New Orleans. In May, 1880, the combination leased the Western Railroad's line between Montgomery and Selma.<sup>40</sup>

This consolidation of lines caused more concern in Montgomery than in any of the other large Alabama towns. Although Mobile, Birmingham, and Selma were all served by Louisville and Nashville roads, each had another road entering the town, thereby creating a competitive point.<sup>41</sup> The Louisville and Nashville, however, controlled lines running north, west, and south of Montgomery, and the Georgia road, closely linked to the Louisville and Nashville system, controlled the lines running eastward from the city. The Louisville and Nashville had negotiated contracts with the Georgia roads for the operation of their lines in close connection with its own; the Louisville company also owned fifty per cent of a lease controlling the Georgia Railroad and Banking Company, and had a common director with the Georgia Central Railroad.<sup>42</sup> It is not surprising, then, to find shippers of Montgomery and vicinity leading the movement for railroad legislation in an effort to counteract this threatened strangle-hold by the Louisville combination. The *Montgomery Advertiser* did not itself assume a belligerent attitude toward the railroad, but its columns were filled with numerous protests from correspondents, all of whom argued that the legislature, at its coming session, should consider regulatory legislation.<sup>43</sup>

<sup>40</sup> John L. Kerr, *The Story of a Southern Carrier: The Louisville and Nashville* (New York, 1933), 37-38, 42; Owen, *History of Alabama*, II, 906; *Poor's Manual*, 1880, p. 545; 1884, p. 510.

<sup>41</sup> Birmingham evidenced no concern as long as the Louisville monopoly spread no further. *Birmingham Independent*, January 31, 1880.

<sup>42</sup> *Poor's Manual*, 1880, p. 465; 1884, pp. 435, 506, 511; *Montgomery Advertiser*, January 28, February 13, 14, 1880. This connection between the Louisville and Nashville and the Georgia roads seems to have been broken in 1883, partly through the efforts of Senator Joseph E. Brown of Georgia. *Birmingham Iron Age*, January 11, 1883.

<sup>43</sup> *Montgomery Advertiser*, February 22, 1880. Other typical protests are cited in John W. Dubose, "History of the Alabama Railroad Commission," *Birmingham Age-Herald*, June 3, 1906.

Other factors increased the possibility that the legislature at this particular time would create some type of railroad commission. In two famous cases decided in 1877, the Supreme Court of the United States had held that railroads were subject to public regulation, and that the responsibility for such regulation rested in the hands of the state legislatures, to be exercised as they saw fit.<sup>44</sup> Moreover, the neighboring state of Georgia had pioneered in this field in the South by creating in 1879 a railroad commission with strong powers.<sup>45</sup>

Thus by the fall of 1880 anti-railroad sentiment throughout Alabama had reached a relatively high pitch, and it was clear that the question would be the most controversial one before the legislature at its next session. Within two weeks after the legislature convened on November 9, regulatory measures were introduced in both houses. On November 30 the senate judiciary committee reported a number of different bills covering the subject. None of these was adopted, however, and chief interest centered on House Bill 171, which had been introduced on November 17 by Charles C. Langdon of Mobile, an "old-line Whig" who had long been a leader of progressive agricultural elements in the state.<sup>46</sup> This bill provided for a strong type of commission to fix all railroad rates. Railroads could appeal for a rehearing on rates which they considered too low, but from a second decision by the commission no further appeal could be taken. After obtaining the views of railroad officials, the house committee reported the bill somewhat altered.<sup>47</sup> The stage was now set for the battle over this important

<sup>44</sup> *Munn v. Illinois* (1877), 94 U. S. 113; *Peik v. Chicago and Northwestern Railway Co.* (1877), 94 U. S. 164.

<sup>45</sup> Ferguson, *Regulation of Railroads in the South*, 96-99; Jim D. Cherry, "The Georgia Railroad Commission" (M.A. Thesis, University of North Carolina, 1941). For comments on the effects of Georgia's action on Alabama, see *Montgomery Advertiser*, March 5, May 7, 1880; *Wetumpka Times*, January 26, 1881.

<sup>46</sup> Alabama Legislature, *House Journal*, 1880-1881, p. 78; *Senate Journal*, 1880-1881, p. 167. Langdon had been mayor of Mobile, and later secretary of state of Alabama. He had also served as editor of the *Mobile Advertiser*, and of the *Rural Alabamian* (Mobile, 1872-1873[?]), a monthly agricultural magazine. Owen, *History of Alabama*, IV, 1008, 1011.

<sup>47</sup> For a copy of the bill as introduced, see *Mobile Daily Register*, November 26, 1880. For the bill as reported from committee, as well as the senate bills, see *Montgomery Advertiser*, January 15, 1881.

question. In accordance with the usual practice on such controversial measures, the legislature postponed both house and senate bills until after the holiday recess, which began on December 8, 1880, and lasted until February 1, 1881.

During this interval argument over the question reached a climax. The *Montgomery Advertiser* reported both sides of the question, but its editor favored a commission with mild powers.<sup>48</sup> Most of the arguments in support of a strong commission followed the traditional line of attack against the great foreign corporations which, it was said, threatened to sacrifice Alabama's prosperity to that of other states. Some opposed any type of railroad legislation whatsoever, saying that it would be unconstitutional and would most assuredly hamper railroad development and other enterprises requiring capital. Henry F. De-Bardeleben, one of the early promoters of Birmingham, warned that if a railroad commission should begin regulation in Alabama, "capital would seek other and more inviting fields for investment."<sup>49</sup> The railroad interests, however, generally recognized as inevitable some type of regulation and confined their efforts to making it as innocuous as possible. W. G. Raoul, vice-president of the Georgia Central, published numerous communications advocating a commission with advisory powers only, such as that of Massachusetts.<sup>50</sup> John W. Lapsley, an influential railroad figure of Shelby County, also supported the cause of railroads, asserting that large combinations were necessary in the South in order to compete with the North and Northwest.<sup>51</sup>

Upon reconvening on February 1, 1881, the legislature resumed consideration of the regulation bills. An incident occurring at this time strengthened the arguments of the forces favoring establishment of a railroad commission. On February 9, a Federal District Court in Georgia decided that the Georgia commission law of 1879 violated neither the Constitution of the United States nor the constitution of

<sup>48</sup> *Montgomery Advertiser*, January-February, 1881, *passim*.

<sup>49</sup> Quoted in *Montgomery Advertiser*, February 5, 1881.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, November 28, 1880, February 22, 1881.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*, April 1-3, 1880, February 2, 23, 1881.

Georgia.<sup>52</sup> An Alabama newspaper concluded that this decision definitely settled the argument over constitutionality since the Georgia and Alabama constitutions differed very little.<sup>53</sup>

After a discussion of some nine days, the house passed its regulation bill by a vote of sixty to twenty-two. It is interesting to note that all but three of the negative votes came from counties of North Alabama where there was stronger public enthusiasm for railroad and industrial development.<sup>54</sup> The senate, however, considered the house measure too severe and passed a substitute bill which gave the commission power to set only those rates submitted to it. Moreover, the rates thus fixed were not to be considered final, but were merely to be classed as non-extortionate unless proved otherwise to the satisfaction of a court of law.<sup>55</sup> Since the session had almost reached its constitutional time limit of fifty days, the house reluctantly, and after much protest, agreed to the report of a conference committee which virtually endorsed the senate substitute.<sup>56</sup>

The act as finally signed by the governor consisted of three parts, the first of which dealt with the heart of the problem by making any railroad which should charge more than just compensation guilty of extortion. Questions as to whether or not specific rates exceeded just compensation were to be decided by the courts when actions were brought by aggrieved shippers. If, however, rates had been approved by the railroad commission, they could not be considered "willfully extortionate." The second part of the act prohibited any rebates or reductions from a set tariff and made such practices misdemeanors. The concluding twenty-four sections provided for the working machinery of the commission itself.<sup>57</sup>

The commission consisted of a president and two associates, serving

<sup>52</sup> *Tilley v. Savannah, Florida, & Western Railroad Co.* (1881), 5 Fed. Rep. 641.

<sup>53</sup> *Montgomery Advertiser*, February 13, 1881.

<sup>54</sup> Alabama Legislature, *House Journal*, 1880-1881, pp. 548-49.

<sup>55</sup> Alabama Legislature, *Senate Journal*, 1880-1881, p. 488; Ferguson, *Regulation of Railroads in the South*, 129.

<sup>56</sup> Alabama Legislature, *House Journal*, 1880-1881, pp. 685, 732, 739, 775; *Montgomery Advertiser*, February 24, 26, 1881.

<sup>57</sup> Alabama Legislature, *Acts*, 1880-1881, p. 85.

terms of two years and chosen by the senate from a list of nine submitted by the governor. Salaries were to be \$3,500 for the president and \$3,000 each for the two associates.<sup>58</sup> It was the duty of the commission to review all tariffs submitted to it by the railroads and to advise of any changes necessary. The commissioners also had to hear all complaints against such approved rates and to render decisions; the decisions would, however, be binding on neither party. The commission had general supervision over all railroads in the state, was required to examine them thoroughly, and authorized to demand in writing all needed information. The commission should also recommend legislation necessary for the better control of railroads and should confer with similar bodies in other states. All expenses of the commission, including salaries, were to be met by the proceeds of a special license tax levied on each railroad according to the amount of its gross income earned within the state of Alabama.

Most observers agreed that the railroad commission act represented a much less mandatory type of control than that originally contemplated by its backers.<sup>59</sup> Rather than making rate decisions by the commission binding on railroads, the law in a sense bribed railroads voluntarily to accept such rates, since it held out the guarantee of less judicial controversy. It certainly differed from the Georgia law, which established a commission with power to prescribe rates upon its own initiative.

The first commission consisted of Walter L. Bragg, as president, with James Crook and Charles P. Ball as associate commissioners. Bragg, a law partner of Senator John T. Morgan, had distinguished himself in politics and had often been mentioned as a possible gubernatorial candidate. Crook represented the agricultural interests, and Ball represented the railroads, having been connected with the Western and the Alabama Great Southern roads.<sup>60</sup> Some sections of the state

<sup>58</sup> These figures were higher than the salaries for other state commissions, except those of California, New York, and Massachusetts. Cullom Report, in *Senate Reports*, 49 Cong., 1 Sess., No. 46, I, 65-66.

<sup>59</sup> Montgomery *Advertiser*, February 26, 1881; Mobile *Daily Register*, March 1, 1881.

<sup>60</sup> Owen, *History of Alabama*, III, 203-204, 428; Montgomery *Advertiser*, March 1, 1881.

expressed dissatisfaction over the fact that two members of the commission and the clerk were from Montgomery.<sup>61</sup>

During the next two years the commissioners undertook a vigorous performance of their duties as outlined in the act of establishment. Bragg proved himself to be an executive of considerable ability and tireless energy. Even the critics of these first commissioners could never accuse them of inefficiency or of shirking their duty; indeed, the chief complaints arose later because the group was too energetic in urging further railroad legislation. Although their terms of office under the law ran for only two years, the senate did not hesitate in 1883 to reappoint all three for second terms.

In addition to hearing numerous complaints and making a careful inspection of the state railroads, the commission undertook the troublesome task of rate revision. All of the railroads in the state submitted their tariff scales to the commission soon after its creation.<sup>62</sup> Although the rates submitted by each road were considered separately, the general result was a drastic reduction in passenger fares from four or five cents to three cents per mile, but only a moderate revision of freight tariffs. The commissioners themselves said: "The commission was influenced by the idea that the public would be much more benefited by cheap travel than by a corresponding reduction in freights."<sup>63</sup> Since the commission had no direct power to enforce its rates, it hesitated to make drastic reductions in the existing freight tariffs.

The general effect of the commission upon the state during the first three and one-half years of its existence was reflected to some extent in the reactions of the press and public. The railroads themselves seem to have accepted the commission and its recommendations with fairly good grace. The commission regularly reported co-operation from the state lines in furnishing statistics and carrying out recommendations.<sup>64</sup> Although the roads naturally opposed any reductions in fares or rates,

<sup>61</sup> *Mobile Daily Register*, March 4, 1881; *Huntsville Advocate*, March 2, 1881; *Florence News*, quoted in *Huntsville Advocate*, March 23, 1881.

<sup>62</sup> *Alabama Railroad Commission Report*, 1881, p. 150.

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*, 151.

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*, 148; 1882, p. 91; 1885, p. 13.

they finally accepted all revised tariffs.<sup>65</sup> Bragg said: "I know that the railroad companies hate a Railroad Commission like the devil hates holy water, and while I say that, my personal relations and those of the other Commissioners have been and are friendly with all the railroad managers and agents of the State."<sup>66</sup> At another time he wrote: "Up until the fall of 1884, the railroads seemed disposed to co-operate with the commission, albeit reluctantly."<sup>67</sup>

Perhaps the railroads realized that the regulatory act might have been much more severe, and that a commission with stronger powers would have been much less considerate of their interests. Thus, failure to co-operate with the new body would have appeared contumacious and might even have provoked more stringent regulatory laws. Moreover, a railroad found it advantageous to conduct its business under rates approved by the commission, as long as these were not too low; such rates, being "not willfully extortionate," were unlikely to involve the company in many judicial proceedings. By co-operating with the commission, the railroads also noticeably improved their relations with the general public. Both Commissioner Bragg and Colonel Troy noticed this and declared that it was now possible for a railroad to receive a fair trial before a jury,<sup>68</sup> where previously a deep-seated resentment against railroads had often affected the verdict of the juries.

The attitude of the press and public toward the first commission seems to have been somewhat neutral. Its work aroused neither general condemnation nor enthusiastic praise. The average person probably would have agreed with the newspaper which said, "Alabama's advisory R. R. Commission has worked as well as any."<sup>69</sup> Most of the critics accused the commissioners of holding sinecures and of accomplishing practically nothing toward curbing railroad power.<sup>70</sup> Although rail-

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*, 1882, pp. 8, 24.

<sup>66</sup> Bragg, *Speech before Senate Judiciary Committee*, 38.

<sup>67</sup> *Montgomery Advertiser*, January 11, 1885.

<sup>68</sup> Bragg, *Speech before Senate Judiciary Committee*, 35, 38.

<sup>69</sup> *Montgomery Advertiser*, January 16, 1883.

<sup>70</sup> The majority of the criticisms came from papers in North Alabama. See *Huntsville Advocate*, June 29, 1881; *Jasper Mountain Eagle*, quoted in *Huntsville Advocate*, August 17, 1881; *Florence News*, quoted in *Huntsville Advocate*, March 23, 1881; *Tuskegee Weekly*, quoted in *Montgomery Advertiser*, April 28, 1881.



road officials did not outwardly oppose the commission, they were accused of stimulating dissatisfaction with its work.<sup>71</sup>

The legislative session of 1884-1885 witnessed the crucial test to determine whether the new commission should continue as a half-mandatory, half-advisory body or should be given more extensive powers of control. In 1880 almost everyone had agreed on the necessity of creating some kind of commission, but in 1884 the lines of battle were much more clearly drawn on the question of what such a commission should do. Some people favored increasing materially the power of the commission, others favored continuing its existing status, and some favored abolishing it altogether. The controversy was precipitated by the question of freight rates on through shipments from points in the West, outside of the state, to Opelika. In June, 1884, the commission rendered its decision in the case of *Messrs. Hudman & Crayton v. Western Railway of Alabama*, in which it stated that through rates to Opelika from the West should be the same as to Columbus, Georgia. Commissioners Bragg and Crook signed the decision, but Commissioner Ball, who represented railroad interests, did not agree and submitted a minority opinion stating that such a matter was outside the jurisdiction of a state commission.<sup>72</sup> When the Western Railroad refused to accept this decision on the basis that Opelika was not a competitive point,<sup>73</sup> Bragg determined to request from the legislature additional power for the commission sufficient to force compliance with its rulings. Practically the entire report of the commission for 1884 was taken up with these recommendations and with bills proposed for legislative action. Again Commissioner Ball dissented from the recommendation.<sup>74</sup>

Bills embodying Bragg's recommendations were introduced on November 14, 1884, in the senate and on November 17 in the house. It was proposed that the organization of the commission be revised and that its powers be considerably increased. Under these bills the

<sup>71</sup> James Crook to Messrs. Bragg and Ball, March 23, 1881, in Miscellaneous Correspondence of Railroad Commission (Alabama Department of Archives and History).

<sup>72</sup> Decision printed in full in *Montgomery Advertiser*, June 21, 1884.

<sup>73</sup> *Montgomery Advertiser*, December 9, 1884.

<sup>74</sup> *Alabama Railroad Commission Report*, 1884, pp. 23-28, 45-88; *Montgomery Advertiser*, December 7, 1884.

commission's rate rulings would no longer be mere *prima facie* evidence, but would have the force of legal decisions. Appeals from such rulings could be made directly to the Alabama Supreme Court. Moreover, the commissioners would be empowered to institute, through the attorney general, criminal suits for violation of their regulations. One section of one of the bills required the railroads to make such changes in manner of operation and mode of business as seemed proper to the commission.<sup>75</sup>

Immediately there arose both inside and outside the legislature a fiery controversy over these bills. During December, 1884, and January and February, 1885, the press contained numerous arguments both for and against the legislation. Commissioner Bragg himself headed the campaign in support of the new laws, writing lengthy communications emphasizing the necessity for change and replying to the arguments of opponents.<sup>76</sup> Bragg asserted that he was not moved by any spirit of vengeance toward the railroads but was merely raising his individual voice against these public corporations which he felt were oppressing the people of the state. "You might as well," he said, "throw grass at a boy up an apple tree as to talk about small fines and small penalties against a railroad company."<sup>77</sup> He cited the lack of a national regulatory agency as one of the chief reasons for needing a stronger state agency. He referred to the Peik case as authority for a state's regulatory action which might affect indirectly parties outside of the state.<sup>78</sup>

A formidable opposition met these advocates of stronger state regulation. The press generally opposed any change in the railroad laws; some papers even took advantage of the unrest to urge complete abo-

<sup>75</sup> Alabama Legislature, *Senate Journal*, 1884-1885, p. 890; *House Journal*, 1884-1885, pp. 723-24. These bills were printed in full in the *Montgomery Advertiser*, January 18, 1885.

<sup>76</sup> *Montgomery Advertiser*, January 4, 11, 18, 1885.

<sup>77</sup> Bragg, *Speech before Senate Judiciary Committee*, 11.

<sup>78</sup> *Ibid.*, 9. The Peik case had been decided in 1877, and it was not until 1886 that the United States Supreme Court changed its stand by forbidding a state to take any action affecting, even indirectly, interstate commerce. *Stone v. Farmers Loan and Trust Co.* (1886), 116 U. S. 307; *Wabash, St. Louis and Pacific Railway Co. v. Illinois* (1886), 118 U. S. 560.

lition of the commission.<sup>79</sup> The *Montgomery Advertiser* considered the commission as constituted sufficient for the needs of the times.<sup>80</sup> The *Mobile Register* pursued a vigorous campaign to correct what it described as a popular idea "that the railroads are the natural enemies of the people."<sup>81</sup> A Birmingham paper described as absurd the effort to accuse railroads of trying to crush the agricultural interests of the state.<sup>82</sup> The few papers which did support the proposed changes accused other papers of being paid by the railroads to copy "sentiment of the state press previously subsidized."<sup>83</sup>

In opposition to the changes, the railroads supported a powerful lobby whose actions were much more vigorous than during the 1880-1881 session.<sup>84</sup> Commissioner Bragg described the lobby as swarming around the legislature "spreading its misrepresentations."<sup>85</sup> The attitude of the mercantile and business groups may be inferred from the numerous anti-regulation petitions signed by these groups and published in state papers. Such petitions came from merchants in Montgomery, Mobile, Birmingham, Selma, and other centers.<sup>86</sup> This change from the stand taken by Montgomery shippers in 1880 was well illustrated when Colonel Troy spoke vigorously in the senate against increasing the commission's powers.<sup>87</sup> It is also significant that one of the later Populist leaders, Reuben F. Kolb, not only opposed the legislation

<sup>79</sup> *Warrior Enterprise*, January 15, 1885. See also a number of papers quoted in *Montgomery Advertiser*, January 4, 1885, and those quoted in Moore, *History of Alabama*, 598-99.

<sup>80</sup> *Montgomery Advertiser*, January 10, 1885.

<sup>81</sup> *Mobile Daily Register*, December 12, 1884. In its issues of November 9, 23, 1884, this paper carried two to three pages publicizing at length the contributions made to Mobile and its vicinity by the Mobile and Ohio and the Louisville and Nashville railroads.

<sup>82</sup> *Birmingham Chronicle*, March 1, 1885.

<sup>83</sup> *Opelika Times*, quoted in *Montgomery Advertiser*, January 11, 1885; *Selma Times*, quoted in *Montgomery Advertiser*, January 6, 1885.

<sup>84</sup> Moore, *History of Alabama*, 597-98.

<sup>85</sup> Quoted in *Montgomery Advertiser*, January 11, 1885.

<sup>86</sup> *Troy Enquirer*, January 17, 31, 1885; *Montgomery Advertiser*, December 6, 7, 1884; *Mobile Daily Register*, December 6, 1884. Commissioner Bragg and others accused the railroads of preparing these petitions and sending them up and down their lines for signatures. *Montgomery Advertiser*, January 4, 1885.

<sup>87</sup> *Montgomery Advertiser*, January 27, 1885.

but recommended the complete abolition of the commission.<sup>88</sup> The proposed legislation was condemned as an unconstitutional regulation of interstate commerce by state action and as a hindrance to the further extension of railroads in the state.<sup>89</sup>

When the question finally came to a vote, on February 3, 1885, the railroad bills passed the senate by a close margin, but they had been so altered in committee that they made only slight changes in the existing laws.<sup>90</sup> The house failed to act on its own bills and adjourned on February 17, 1885, before considering the senate measures.<sup>91</sup> Thus Commissioner Bragg's efforts to put "teeth" into the railroad commission law of Alabama resulted in naught save a great deal of agitation, reverberations from which lasted for some time thereafter.

It was feared that the advocates of stronger regulation would carry their fight into state politics, and to some extent this did happen. At the close of the legislative session, eleven senators and nineteen representatives, meeting in Bragg's office, signed an open address to the people of the state, accusing the railroads of having forced a decision on the legislature and urging the people to campaign for the election of "right men" to the next legislature. Of the thirty signatories, twenty resided in eastern and southeastern agricultural counties.<sup>92</sup> Bragg undoubtedly had political ambitions, but he did not appear as a candidate of the anti-railroad forces during the campaign of 1886, partly, perhaps, because railroad regulation was no longer a controversial issue in state politics, and partly because he was being prominently mentioned for federal positions.<sup>93</sup> In 1887 he became a member of the new Interstate Commerce Commission and served until his death in 1891.<sup>94</sup>

The state commission which took office on March 1, 1885, consisted

<sup>88</sup> *Ibid.*, December 31, 1884.

<sup>89</sup> *Mobile Daily Register*, December 6, 12, 1884; *Montgomery Advertiser*, January 11, 1885.

<sup>90</sup> Alabama Legislature, *Senate Journal*, 1884-1885, pp. 404, 422, 436.

<sup>91</sup> Alabama Legislature, *House Journal*, 1884-1885, pp. 890, 1020.

<sup>92</sup> *Mobile Daily Register*, February 21, 24, 1885; *Grove Hill Clark County Democrat*, March 5, 1885.

<sup>93</sup> *Montgomery Advertiser*, July 14, 1886, January 22, 1887.

<sup>94</sup> Owen, *History of Alabama*, III, 204.

of Henry R. Shorter as president, with Levi W. Lawler and Wiley C. Tunstall as associates. This group immediately washed its hands of the Opelika rate troubles by saying that any question affecting interstate commerce could not come within its jurisdiction; at the same time it felt certain that Congress soon would provide such regulation.<sup>95</sup> From this time until the first decade of the twentieth century, little railroad agitation stirred the people of Alabama. The commission itself assumed the role of a mere fact-finding group leniently supervising the roads rather than a body anxious to increase its own power or to curb that of the railroads. Such a group did not find favor with many elements in the state except the railroads themselves and those interested in their development. It is not surprising, therefore, to find many suggestions for its abolition during the 1880's and the 1890's, with Reuben F. Kolb and the Farmers Alliance assuming the leadership.<sup>96</sup> But as long as the railroads bore the expenses of the commission and were satisfied with its work, the complaints of those in opposition had little effect.

To summarize, the movement for railroad regulation in Alabama stemmed primarily from agricultural elements in the Black Belt and eastern Alabama who feared that the corporations would exploit them and take advantage of their weak economic condition. Little was accomplished, however, until the large shippers of the urban centers decided that the railroads were becoming too powerful and monopolistic. Alabama's first commission evidently satisfied this urban group, since they successfully opposed Bragg's efforts to create a truly mandatory type in 1884. The Alabama commission in its early years was not a complete failure. It did remedy the most glaring abuses on the part of the railroads and served as a potential agency for stricter control whenever the people should desire so to use it.

<sup>95</sup> *Alabama Railroad Commission Report*, 1886, pp. 24-25; *Montgomery Advertiser*, May 5, 1885.

<sup>96</sup> Clark, *Populism in Alabama*, 43; Moore, *History of Alabama*, 599-600.

# The Southern Industrial Gospel before 1860

BY HERBERT COLLINS

Those who were in the vanguard of the southern cotton mill crusade frequently inquired why Southerners persisted in patronizing northern industry to the neglect of sponsoring manufacturing establishments at home. They asserted that southern industrialization could be a community activity worthy of encouragement. In 1845, for example, the editor of the Milledgeville *Federal Union* testified to the sympathetic attitude of the public toward the idea of southern manufacturing enterprise. "The success which has attended the efforts of those who have ventured their capital and labor . . . has at last opened the eyes of the community," he said. "Every paper we received from the cotton growing region, seems alive to the importance of this subject, and many contain notices of the rise of new establishments in various branches of this almost untried field."<sup>1</sup>

According to other advocates of industrialization, the feeling that there was something contradictory about manufacturing in the South was a prejudice which had to be overcome at home, as well as in the nation at large.<sup>2</sup> However unpopular the doctrine of encouraging industry may have been, William Gregg, of Graniteville, South Carolina, was convinced that those who shared the agricultural exclusivism of such men as Langdon Cheves would eventually succumb to the contagious ar-

<sup>1</sup> Ulrich B. Phillips (ed.), *Plantation and Frontier*, 2 vols. (Cleveland, 1910), II, 302. See also, "Manufacturing in the Southern States," in *The Farmer and Mechanic* (New York, 1844-1852), New Series, III (1849), 244-45.

<sup>2</sup> "Our habits and prejudices are against manufacturing, but we must yield to the force of things, and profit by the indications of nature." *Report on the Establishment of Cotton and Woolen Manufacturers and on the Growing of Wool, Made in the House of Commons of North Carolina on Tuesday, January 1, 1828* (Raleigh, 1828), 60.

guments for southern industrialization.<sup>3</sup> The caution exhibited in an address delivered by James H. Taylor, a Charleston textile manufacturer, on the occasion of the organization of the South Carolina Institute in 1849 afforded evidence that those who wished to support the development of manufacturing enterprise were aware of the delicacy of their position. The founders of the Institute did not wish to attack the "established mode of thought or action," Taylor explained, but they would "attempt to present *facts*, which bear upon our present condition, and illustrative of the wonderful results produced by a diversity of industrial pursuits." The object of the Institute was the promotion of "art, mechanical ingenuity, and industry," and it was hoped that those who joined would be willing to break with old habits of thought. "The South will demand from you," he continued, "from every active man, *invention - skill - industry - enterprise*."<sup>4</sup> In a comparable spirit, Joseph Henry Lumpkin, a judge in the Supreme Court of Georgia and a cotton mill crusader, claimed that the diversification of the southern economy necessitated the abandonment of prejudices, however deep-rooted, "against this new order of things."<sup>5</sup> In 1842, the English traveler, James Silk Buckingham, a captious critic of the factory system, toured the South and reported conversations with Southerners who deplored the introduction of factories, "and wish that the labours of the people should be confined to agriculture, leaving manufactures to Europe or to the States of the North."<sup>6</sup>

As long as such an outlook was stenciled upon the economic think-

<sup>3</sup> William Gregg, "Essays on Domestic Industry," in Daniel A. Tompkins, *Cotton Mill, Commercial Features* (Charlotte, N. C., 1899), 210-11. Gregg's "Essays" were first published as a series of articles in the *Charleston Courier*, beginning September 20, 1844, and later reprinted as a pamphlet entitled, *Essays on Domestic Industry: or, An Inquiry into the Expediency of Establishing Cotton Manufactures in South-Carolina* (Charleston, 1845). Tompkins reprinted the entire pamphlet as an appendix to his book (pp. 207-44), "because it seems to me that his arguments are as good today and for our time, as for the time in which they were written and published." *Cotton Mill, Commercial Features*, 206. Subsequent references to the "Essays" in this study are to the Tompkins reprint.

<sup>4</sup> *Constitution of the South-Carolina Institute, Adopted January, 1849* (Charleston, 1849), 11, 17-18.

<sup>5</sup> Joseph H. Lumpkin, "The Industrial Regeneration of the South," in *De Bow's Review* (New Orleans, 1846-1880), XII (1852), 43.

<sup>6</sup> James S. Buckingham, *The Slave States of America*, 2 vols. (London, 1842), II, 112.

ing of Southerners, the cotton mill advocates were arraigned as challengers of the dominant social order. In 1850, James D. B. De Bow, the New Orleans publisher and economist, seeking facts and figures with which to meet such criticism and to convince the people of the South that they could successfully operate cotton mills, sought the aid of Charles Tillinghast James, an experienced New England textile engineer.<sup>7</sup> Other Southerners had also begun to solicit James' advice; and James himself reported to Freeman Hunt, editor of *Hunt's Merchants' Magazine*, that "The Southern people wished for information on the subject of cotton manufactures in order to know whether it was, or was not, prudent for them to engage in the business." He did not withhold the accumulated evidence of his twenty years of industrial experience; but he also explained that his writings on the subject of manufacturing in the South were intended "to promote the interest of that section of our common country, without the most remote wish to injure that of any other."<sup>8</sup> As one of the proponents of southern "redemption," he agreed with such men as Hunt and Henry C. Carey in regarding the South as ripe for industrial transformation.<sup>9</sup> In such a transformation he perceived another instrument for the conquest of sectionalism. Identifying himself with southern interests, he labored to open the eyes of Southerners to the advantages they possessed for engaging in the manufacture of cotton.

At the "special request of southern men" James wrote a much discussed pamphlet in 1849, which he called *Practical Hints on the Comparative Cost and Productiveness of the Culture of Cotton, and the Cost and Productiveness of Its Manufacture*.<sup>10</sup> Its contents were widely circulated in an abridged form in the pages of *Hunt's Merchants'*

<sup>7</sup> *De Bow's Review*, X (1851), 680. See also, "Gallery of Industry and Enterprise," *ibid.*, IX (1850), 671-75.

<sup>8</sup> Charles T. James, "Culture and Manufacture of Cotton," in *Hunt's Merchants' Magazine* (New York, 1840-1870), XXII (1850), 309-11.

<sup>9</sup> See George W. Smith, "Ante-Bellum Attempts of Northern Business Interests to 'Redeem' the Upper South," in *Journal of Southern History* (Baton Rouge, 1935- ), XI (1945), 177-213.

<sup>10</sup> Published at Providence, R. I., in 1849.



*Magazine*,<sup>11</sup> and as a serial in five issues of *De Bow's Review*.<sup>12</sup> In this economic tract, James assembled a galaxy of information, sometimes controversial, on the subject of cotton mill investments and construction. Shortly thereafter he became involved with Amos A. Lawrence, a New England textile manufacturer, in a controversy over the advisability of industrializing the South,<sup>13</sup> but from his original advocacy of the desirability of engaging in the manufacture of cotton in the South, he never retreated. "The United States ought to be, emphatically *the cotton* manufacturer of the world," he insisted, "and the cotton *growing* states should become the *great cotton manufacturing* states of the Union."<sup>14</sup> After the controversy with Lawrence, James indicated his continued adherence to his convictions by remarking in a letter to De Bow that "one would suppose that the people . . . at the South . . . would readily discern the almost innumerable incentives to enter into the cotton manufacturing business."<sup>15</sup>

Hamilton Smith was another Northerner who sought to "redeem" the South. A Louisville businessman who had emigrated from New England, Smith became interested in the Cannelton, Indiana, coal and industrial improvement project which had also attracted the attention of Charles T. James. He was particularly disinclined to excuse the rejoinders of Lawrence to the initial excursion of James into the cotton mill controversy. One of the most prominent topics of discussion in the newspapers of the South and the West, he reminded Lawrence, was "not whether cotton mills could or could not be operated at home, but when, where and by whom they could be put in operation."<sup>16</sup> Indeed, that was just about where the cotton mill crusade stood in 1850. The voice of encouragement, although it continued to be heard, as in 1855

<sup>11</sup> Charles T. James, "The Production and Manufacture of Cotton and Its Manufacture in the Cotton Growing States," in *Hunt's Merchants' Magazine*, XXI (1849), 492-502.

<sup>12</sup> Charles T. James, "Cotton and Cotton Manufacture at the South," in *De Bow's Review*, VII (1849), 173-76, 370-72; VIII (1850), 307-11, 462-66, 556-60.

<sup>13</sup> Amos A. Lawrence, "The Condition and Prospects of American Cotton Manufactures in 1849," in *Hunt's Merchants' Magazine*, XXI (1849), 628-33; XXII (1850), 26-33; James, "Culture and Manufacture of Cotton," *loc. cit.*, 184-94, 290-311.

<sup>14</sup> James, *Practical Hints*, 21.

<sup>15</sup> *De Bow's Review*, X (1851), 680.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, VIII (1850), 551.

when a lecturer announced before the Randolph County Society that the "true policy of North Carolina . . . to encourage the establishment and growth of manufactories"<sup>17</sup> was to be supported in the future by practical suggestions. "If the legislatures will not move in this work," one crusader indicated, "let societies be formed for the purpose of collecting facts."<sup>18</sup>

The barriers of controversy could not militate forever against the inquisitiveness of those Southerners who were determined to investigate the economics of cotton textile manufacturing. A reporter for the New York *Herald*, writing in 1849 from Graniteville, South Carolina, where William Gregg and his associates had located a model cotton mill and village,<sup>19</sup> pointed to southern investigations and statistical compilations of northern and New England manufacturing enterprise "to show and convince the people of the South that cotton manufactories would be in the South, and that they would successfully compete with New England manufactories."<sup>20</sup>

That the attitude reported by Buckingham in 1842 had changed during the succeeding decade is indicated by the fact that in 1856 another Englishman, James Stirling, reported having come upon many men in the South who spoke of industrialization "as if it were an affair of patronage and encouragement," and a thing to be extemporized by the resolutions of a commercial convention.<sup>21</sup> Had he visited Gallatin, Tennessee, Stirling might have learned of the proposals of E. Steadman, superintendent of the Sumner Manufacturing Company and cotton mill publicist, to boycott those "intermeddling fanatics" whose cotton mills in the North were turning out clothing for the labor force on southern

<sup>17</sup> Alfred G. Foster, *Address before the Randolph County Society for the Promotion of Agriculture, the Mechanic Arts and Manufactures* (Lexington, N. C., 1855), 18.

<sup>18</sup> Cited in James D. B. De Bow, *The Industrial Resources, etc., of the Southern and Western States*, 3 vols. (New Orleans, 1853), II, 114.

<sup>19</sup> See *Farmer and Mechanic*, New Series, II (1848), 475-76, and Broadus Mitchell, *William Gregg; Factory Master of the Old South* (Chapel Hill, 1928), *passim*. For correspondence concerning this enterprise, see Thomas P. Martin (ed.), "The Advent of William Gregg and the Graniteville Company," in *Journal of Southern History*, XI (1945), 389-423.

<sup>20</sup> Cited in *Farmer and Mechanic*, New Series, III (1849), 317.

<sup>21</sup> James Stirling, *Letters from the Slave States* (London, 1857), 79.

plantations.<sup>22</sup> If, furthermore, he had had the opportunity to read Hinton Rowan Helper's later indictment of the South for complacent reliance upon the North for every conceivable article of consumption from a needle to a coffin,<sup>23</sup> he would have found confirmation of his own observations that Southerners were as serious about factories as about publishing houses, railways, direct trade with Europe, lyceums, and manuring.<sup>24</sup>

This seriousness, sometimes verging on urgency, sharpened the efforts to give an impetus to manufacturing in the South. The movement to encourage and promote the manufacture of cotton was not far removed from the impulse which led to the publication of such a magazine as the *Southern Quarterly Review* in 1842, or from the general convening habit which descended upon southern cities after 1837 in the form of commercial conventions, or from the movement to find employment for poor whites in manufacturing establishments, which found expression in the South Carolina Institute after 1849. Although the expression varied, the spirit was consistent. As southern textile manufacture gradually increased, the spirit of competition with the North was quickened. "Doubt it who may," Judge Lumpkin warned in 1850, "the South is destined soon to become the seat of the cotton manufactures of the world. The competition has been forced upon us, and our people are

<sup>22</sup> E. Steadman, *The Southern Manufacturer* (Gallatin, Tenn., 1858), 17-19, 24. Steadman was one of the few to point out the relationship between internal improvements and manufacturing enterprise. In 1851 he wrote that Georgia "has demonstrated, as well as the northern States, that manufacturing and internal improvement go hand in hand, and that the one is the natural ally and auxiliary of the other." *A Brief Treatise on Manufacturing in the South* (Clarksville, Tenn., 1851), 5. Duncan Cameron, James Iredell, and Daniel L. Barringer, all of North Carolina, also enlarged upon the scope of internal improvements to include manufactures. See *Proceedings of the Internal Improvement Convention Held in the City of Raleigh, 1833* (Raleigh, 1834), 28-29.

<sup>23</sup> Hinton R. Helper, *The Impending Crisis of the South: How to Meet It* (New York, 1860), 21-24, 75, 355-57. An earlier variation of this theme was heard at the New Orleans Commercial Convention in 1855. See Frederick Law Olmsted, *A Journey in the Seaboard Slave States in the Years 1853-1854, with Remarks on Their Economy*, 2 vols. (New York, 1904), II, 186.

<sup>24</sup> Stirling, *Letters from the Slave States*, 78-79, 235. See also, Steadman, *Southern Manufacturer*, v-vi; Helper, *Impending Crisis*, 332-33, 390; *De Bow's Review*, X (1851), 106-107, 362-63.

beginning to be thoroughly aroused from their apathy."<sup>25</sup> In 1849, an overseer interviewed by William Cullen Bryant told him that he was prepared to persuade his friends, "who have been almost ruined by this southern competition," to abandon their northern factories and manufacture cotton in the South.<sup>26</sup>

The potentiality of the South for the manufacture of cotton textiles and the threat of competition with the North had provoked the Lawrence-James controversy in the pages of *Hunt's Merchants' Magazine*. Replying to the pamphlet written by James in 1849, Lawrence stated that he hoped nothing would be said or done to discourage manufacturing in the South. "At the same time," he continued, "we shall consider it to be doing a service to them and to us at the North, if we bring to light errors which might deceive those who are beginning to inquire into this business, with reference to pursuing it."<sup>27</sup> In his reply to Lawrence, Hamilton Smith interpreted such an expression of concern as dissimulation,<sup>28</sup> while James, with greater vehemence, portrayed Lawrence as "struck with horror at the startling apparition of southern competition," and charged him of attempting "to intimidate the people of the South; and thus to discourage them from the attempt to improve the advantages they possess for a successful competition with the North."<sup>29</sup>

But such manifestations of interest from northern protagonists could not change the fact that fundamentally only the sympathy and support of Southerners could implement the impulse to manufacture cotton in the South. Although some advocates of cotton mills delved into the fine points of meteorology to prove or discredit the inviting nature of the southern climate, these remained academic questions in the face of raw materials and other resources. The Friends of Domestic Industry, assembled in New York City in 1831, took the traditional stand that the

<sup>25</sup> Joseph H. Lumpkin, *An Address Delivered before the South-Carolina Institute at Its Second Annual Fair on the 19th November, 1850* (Charleston, 1851), 23.

<sup>26</sup> William Cullen Bryant, *Letters of a Traveller; or, Notes of Things Seen in Europe and America* (New York, 1850), 348.

<sup>27</sup> Lawrence, "Condition and Prospects," *loc. cit.*, 628.

<sup>28</sup> *De Bow's Review*, VIII (1850), 550-55.

<sup>29</sup> James, "Culture and Manufacture of Cotton," *loc. cit.*, 185-86.

unrivaled position of the United States as a cotton manufacturing nation emanated not only from a remarkable spirit of business enterprise, but equally as much from "the immense advantage of producing the staple at home."<sup>30</sup> This the most rabid opponents of southern textile industrialization were never to deny; but they perennially contended that improvement in the techniques of cotton culture was a far greater responsibility of the South than was the conversion of cotton into yarn and cloth.<sup>31</sup>

There was no lack of enthusiasm, however, for the argument that the proximity of cotton should afford an advantage to the South in the manufacture of cotton goods. The North Carolina General Assembly was told in 1828, for example, that "The hand of nature itself seems to point . . . to manufactories" in that state,<sup>32</sup> and later commentators rarely overlooked an opportunity to emphasize such possibilities. William Gregg demonstrated his confidence by organizing the Graniteville Manufacturing Company in 1845 as an experiment in the use of southern white laborers to manufacture textiles from the cotton produced with Negro labor; and by 1850 he was seeking to convince Northerners of the South's advantage in such an enterprise.<sup>33</sup> During the next decade, Steadman, the Tennessee apostle of the industrial gospel, presented similar arguments;<sup>34</sup> and on the eve of the Civil War, Thomas P. Kettell wrote: "In the Southern States, the choice of fresher material direct from the plantation, less the cost of expensive transportation, gives the advantage, and is materially drawing . . . the mills to the

<sup>30</sup> *General Convention of the Friends of Domestic Industry, Assembled at New York, October 26, 1831: Reports of Committees* (Baltimore, 1831), 107.

<sup>31</sup> See Edward Atkinson, "Report on the Cotton Manufactures of the United States," in *Report on the Manufactures of the United States at the Tenth Census, June 1, 1880* (Washington, 1883), 12; Interview with Atkinson, in *New York Herald*, April 23, 1879; Address by Atkinson before the International Cotton Exposition, in *Atlanta Constitution*, November 4, 1881; Edward Atkinson, "Future Situs of the Cotton Manufacture," in *Popular Science Monthly* (New York, 1872- ), XXVIII (1890), 270, 304.

<sup>32</sup> *Report on the Establishment of Cotton and Woolen Manufactures*, 50.

<sup>33</sup> See especially, William Gregg to Freeman Hunt, December 20, 1849, in *Hunt's Merchants' Magazine*, XXII (1850), 108, and Gregg to Amos A. Lawrence, September 2, 1850, in Martin (ed.), "Advent of William Gregg and the Graniteville Company," *loc. cit.*, 421-23.

<sup>34</sup> Steadman, *Southern Manufacturer*, 10-13.

neighborhood of plantations, where the supply and choice of the best cotton are at hand."<sup>35</sup>

In the efforts to prove that the South had a competitive advantage over New England, such expenses as bagging, rope, sampling, river and ocean freight, insurance, wharfage, commissions, and drayage charges were all reckoned as savings, sometimes at ridiculously high percentages. Attention was also called to the fact that the grower could deliver his cotton to a southern mill as cheaply as to a southern port, and that in eliminating the long voyage from the port to the New England mills he would not only save the cost of extra handling and transportation but would also avoid the hazards of extended exposure to rain, mud, and deterioration.<sup>36</sup> Thus, the argument ran, the development of manufacturing in the South would bring both a reduction in the cost of producing cotton goods and an improvement in the quality of the raw material from which such goods were produced.

But these arguments based on the proximity of cotton were only the outward manifestations of a more far-reaching interest, which perhaps envisaged the possibility of accomplishing a fundamental change in the character of southern economic enterprise. Since cotton growing seemed to overshadow any other single activity in the region and to dictate the general tenor of the economic thinking, it was natural that the advocates of industrialization should give their first attention to the promotion of cotton manufacturing. One South Carolina editor, for example, using the over-production of cotton as his starting point, suggested in 1849 that since such over-production was the result of concentration of labor in the cultivation of cotton a more desirable division of labor could be attained "by manufacturing a portion of that surplus staple at home," and a better price could then be obtained for that part of the crop that might be sent out of the South.<sup>37</sup> Three years later the editor

<sup>35</sup> Thomas P. Kettell, *Southern Wealth and Northern Profits* (New York, 1860), 57.

<sup>36</sup> See James, *Practical Hints*, 34; *Farmer and Mechanic*, New Series, III (1849), 318; *De Bow's Review*, VIII (1850), 72; Gregg, "Essays on Domestic Industry," *loc. cit.*, 217; Gregg to James H. Hammond, June 20, 1849, in Martin (ed.), "Advent of William Gregg and the Graniteville Company," *loc. cit.*, 417.

<sup>37</sup> *Columbia Telegraph*, cited in *Farmer and Mechanic*, New Series, III (1849), 377.

of a Philadelphia periodical returned to the same theme, and claimed that because of its low cost of living, its abundant labor supply, and its resources in coal and iron, the South had reached the end of its economic apprenticeship and was ready for unlimited expansion in the manufacture of cotton goods.<sup>38</sup> Others saw great promise for industry in the salubrity of the climate, the accessibility of building materials, the limitless water power, and the reservoir of tractable labor.<sup>39</sup>

In the end, however, the materialization of this urge for industrial development in the South would depend less upon the natural advantage of proximity to the raw materials than upon the availability of capital for financing the organization and operation of manufacturing plants. Here the fact that southern capital consisted largely of land and slaves rather than cash or securities made the outlook somewhat less promising. While there was ample evidence that northern capital could be used, the southern promoters were convinced that the greatest benefits to the South could be realized only through southern participation in the financial responsibilities. Thus they were faced with the necessity of devising plans to facilitate and encourage investment by Southerners. In their initial eagerness for results they sought to counteract the scarcity of easily convertible capital by arguing that the advantage of lower costs would apply to the construction and equipment of factories in the South as well as to their operation. This brought warnings from James that "cheap factories" would inevitably mean antiquated machinery and incompetent management, and from Gregg that it would be a grave mistake to undertake cotton manufacturing with a small capital investment.<sup>40</sup> In fact Gregg even went so far as to advise that until extensive capital was available the southern mills should con-

<sup>38</sup> "Manufactures at the South," in *The Plough, the Loom, and the Anvil* (Philadelphia, 1848-1857), IV (1852), 472.

<sup>39</sup> Foster, *Address before the Randolph County Society*, 18; Lumpkin, *Address before the South-Carolina Institute*, 22; De Bow, *Industrial Resources*, II 126; James, *Practical Hints*, 48-52; Hamilton Smith, "Southern and Western Manufactures," in *De Bow's Review*, VII (1849), 131-32.

<sup>40</sup> James, *Practical Hints*, 65-67; William Gregg, "Fifth Annual Report of the Treasurer of the Graniteville Company, 1854," cited in Steadman, *Southern Manufacturer*, 28-29.

fine their operations to supplying the yarn market rather than attempting the production of finished goods.<sup>41</sup>

Such were the admonitions; but the problem of raising capital could not be solved by negative statements. To the cotton mill advocates the cotton crop seemed to offer the surest source of capital and as one possible solution they proposed that part of the crop be withheld from exportation as an incentive to manufacture at home. Viewed from a different angle, the curtailing of cotton production was also considered as a device for raising the price of cotton, for diverting capital investments into factories, and for breaking the spiral in the price of field labor.<sup>42</sup> A few men thought of raising capital in terms which were less directly connected with the obvious financial possibilities of the cotton economy. One writer proposed, for example, that machinery companies should participate in the financing of cotton mills.<sup>43</sup> As early as 1828, Charles Fisher, a North Carolina legislator, suggested that the lack of capital could be circumvented by inviting northern capital for investment in southern mills.<sup>44</sup> In his address before the South Carolina Institute in 1849, James H. Taylor said: "Be assured *northern enterprise* and *capital* will not long overlook the opening for business here prescribed."<sup>45</sup> If southern objections made such invitations undesirable, there remained the daring alternative of associating the local community in the venture by means of long-term subscriptions to the stock of newly chartered companies. Steadman suggested that capital could be raised "by subscription from all classes of [the] community, but principally from . . . farmers."<sup>46</sup> These proposals were definite forecasts of later attitudes. Machinery companies did participate in launching post-bellum cotton mills; the pros and cons of northern capital were widely

<sup>41</sup> Gregg, "Essays on Domestic Industry," *loc. cit.*, 233.

<sup>42</sup> Steadman, *Brief Treatise on Manufacturing in the South*, 15; Kettell, *Southern Wealth and Northern Profits*, 98-99; *Dry Goods Reporter*, cited in *De Bow's Review*, X (1851), 94; Charles Lyell, *A Second Visit to the United States of North America*, 2 vols. (London, 1849), II, 35, 84, 85; James, *Practical Hints*, 41, 67.

<sup>43</sup> De Bow, *Industrial Resources*, I, 232.

<sup>44</sup> *Report on the Establishment of Cotton and Woolen Manufactures*, 59.

<sup>45</sup> *Constitution of South-Carolina Institute*, 18.

<sup>46</sup> Steadman, *Brief Treatise on Manufacturing in the South*, 24. See also, Gregg, "Essays on Domestic Industry," *loc. cit.*, 231, and Steadman, *Southern Manufacturer*, 98-100.



debated, first to determine the need for northern capital and then to estimate the actual investment; and community subscriptions, so widely popularized by Daniel A. Tompkins during the last two decades of the nineteenth century, became the recognized procedure for financing small-scale cotton mills.

But the effort to use the cotton planter as financier and organizer of cotton mills remained the most important scheme of the ante-bellum crusaders. In terms of social prestige and economic resources, his sponsorship was considered as highly desirable, and there was room in the ranks of the crusade for every planter who might be interested. The extent to which planters actually participated in the building of cotton mills need not be considered here, for it was the possibility rather than the existence of such dual interests that stimulated additional expressions of ante-bellum cotton mill interest in the South. "Let such planters as are desirous of the introduction of manufactures, instead of investing the net income of their crops in land and slaves, appropriate it to the purpose of manufacturing," one writer suggested; and he added that by uniting the surplus capital of a number of planters "an association might be formed with sufficient means to commence the work in every important district in a very short time."<sup>47</sup> In 1850, Judge Lumpkin told the South Carolina Institute that the soundness of manufacturing the cotton crop in the cotton states daily contributed toward bringing about the closer union of the planter and manufacturer;<sup>48</sup> and in the same year a Mississippi planter asserted that the South would eventually come to appreciate "the value of suggestions made by discriminating friends . . . who have brought before the planters the good policy of manufacturing a proportion, at least, of [their] cotton."<sup>49</sup>

One such suggestion was advanced by Hamilton Smith in 1849. The perennial problem of advancing and controlling the price of cotton unraveled before him, as before many of his contemporaries, in a scheme

<sup>47</sup> De Bow, *Industrial Resources*, II, 116.

<sup>48</sup> Lumpkin, *Address before the South-Carolina Institute*, 21. See also, Lumpkin, "Industrial Regeneration of the South," *loc. cit.*, 45; James, *Practical Hints*, 42.

<sup>49</sup> *De Bow's Review*, VIII (1850), 99.

for controlling the fabrication as well as the production of cotton. His first proposal was for the levy of an export duty on cotton to "ensure the fabrication of all *coarse* Cotton goods at home." Yet he realized that while such legislation would act as an incentive to manufacture at home its enactment would be conditioned by the length of time necessary to amend the Constitution of the United States. To the cotton planters, therefore, he turned, and discovered in the possibility of their transformation into manufacturers the most convincing method to foster a cotton textile industry.<sup>50</sup>

A more systematic and detailed method for inaugurating cotton mills was formulated by Mark R. Cockrill, a large-scale sheep raiser in Tennessee who worked one hundred and thirty-five slaves on a cotton plantation in Mississippi. Cockrill's agricultural enterprises fascinated Solon Robinson, experimental farmer, rural architect, and publisher of the *American Agriculturist*, who visited and wrote about the Tennessee sheep-walk.<sup>51</sup> As one way of launching cotton mills, Cockrill advised planters, provision growers, and mechanics to petition their state legislatures for acts of incorporation. The road thus paved, he visualized how fifteen planters, each investing four thousand dollars, selecting a site near their plantations, and with a work-detail of forty-five slaves, could proceed to erect a factory with several cabins at a convenient distance to house the operatives. While construction advanced, the fifteen planters, if they adhered to Cockrill's prospectus, would have solicited subscriptions among their neighbors, or in near-by counties, on a long-term installment plan. A man and four boys or girls would have been taken from the plantations of each stockholder for work under the supervision of a few trained operatives. The stockholders, in turn, being planters, would have furnished the cotton for conversion into yarns and osnaburgs. With this blue print, which was a miniature of schemes actually carried out later under different sponsorship, Cockrill thought it would be possible for every county in all of the cotton states

<sup>50</sup> Hamilton Smith, "Cotton," *ibid.*, VII (1849), 48-51.

<sup>51</sup> Herbert A. Kellar (ed.), *Solon Robinson, Pioneer and Agriculturist: Selected Writings*, 2 vols. (Indianapolis, 1936), I, 549-52; II, 5-11.

to construct two cotton mills "and render the South magnificently rich, and gloriously independent."<sup>52</sup>

Shorn of its economic and political connotations, this crusade and its special gospel remained southern in so far as it was deeply associated with the social as well as the economic welfare of the people of the South. In this the crusaders found a missionary goal. By engaging in manufacturing enterprise, it was also possible to regard oneself as a pioneer in the amelioration of the condition of the poorer whites. Therein lay one of the prevailing inducements to manufacture cotton. Builders of cotton mills were characterized by the *Alabama State Gazette* as in a certain sense "public benefactors."<sup>53</sup> Graniteville, to cite one industrial village, was viewed as a monument of philanthropy dedicated to the welfare of poor-white Southerners.<sup>54</sup> To the cotton mill was attributed the power to quicken the rise of village communities, and to the entrepreneur was imputed philanthropic motives.<sup>55</sup> Glorified as he was, it was inevitable that the cotton mill entrepreneur should leave his stamp upon an epoch in southern social history. He was the leader in a social movement which embraced the white population of the South. He was the organizer of villages, churches, and schools, as well as the builder of manufacturing establishments. As the dispenser of em-

<sup>52</sup> Mark R. Cockrill, "Cotton Mills by Cotton Planters," in *The Plough, the Loom, and the Anvil*, II (1850), 421-26. This plan also appeared in the *Nashville Republican Banner and Whig*, from which it was reprinted in *Farmer and Mechanic*, New Series, III (1849), 533-34. It appeared word for word in *De Bow's Review*, VII (1849), 484-90, under the authorship of "S. R. Cockrill," who stated in a prefatory letter: "Inclosed you will find an article on cotton mills. . . . If you think it worth recording . . . you may insert it over my name." This was undoubtedly Sterling R. Cockrill, a son of Mark, who later became a planter in Arkansas, and who was subsequently associated with the International Cotton Planters Association. See *Atlanta Constitution*, November 4, 1881. Reproductions of the plan also found their way into *De Bow, Industrial Resources*, I, 229-31, and into William J. Barbee, *The Cotton Question* (New York, 1866), 138-41.

<sup>53</sup> Cited in *Farmer and Mechanic*, New Series, III (1849), 177.

<sup>54</sup> "We may really regard ourselves as the pioneers in developing the real character of the poor people of South Carolina." Gregg, "Report," cited in Steadman, *Southern Manufacturer*, 35. See also, Solon Robinson to Freeman Hunt, February 15, 1849, in *Hunt's Merchants' Magazine*, XXII (1850), 351; James H. Taylor, "Manufactures in South Carolina," in *De Bow's Review*, VIII (1850), 27-29.

<sup>55</sup> Steadman, *Southern Manufacturer*, 36; James, *Practical Hints*, 42; Tuscaloosa *Monitor*, cited in *Farmer and Mechanic*, New Series, II (1848), 476; Gregg, "Essays on Domestic Industry," *loc. cit.*, 216, 228-29.

ployment he posed as a benefactor of his race, but he eventually confounded his role by persisting in a maudlin paternalism, which probably confused outsiders as readily as it did the operator himself. Too many have portrayed the cotton mill movement with pathos. It warrants, on the contrary, an awareness that the migration from the land to the factory was not a perpetrated cataclysm but the result of incidental dislocations in the rise of an industrial system in an agricultural milieu.

To put the poor-white population to work was, therefore, a desideratum of the crusade. It sometimes superseded in importance the more pedestrian arguments that cotton mills would release the South from dependence upon the North and that the proximity of cotton was an undeniable inducement for the location of cotton mills. The sense of mission to uplift the weak, unfortunate victims of the cotton economy—the plain people of the South—prevailed in all the considerations of the industrial gospel. The cotton mill was to be the panacea for the South's rural poor. As havens for poor whites, it was argued by the crusaders, cotton mills constituted a "blessing of no ordinary magnitude."<sup>56</sup> According to Lumpkin, the "irrevocable decree" had gone forth that the South intended to manufacture coarse fabrics, not in the spirit of retaliation, "but that our surplus labor may find employment."<sup>57</sup> James H. Taylor, the entrepreneur of the Charleston Steam Cotton Mill, which the Charleston *Mercury* described as "an experiment upon the industrial habits of our people,"<sup>58</sup> championed the hiring of poor whites as cotton mill operatives in order to release them from poverty.<sup>59</sup>

Additional force was given to the arguments for building cotton mills by the belief that "manufacturing labor is supplied from that portion of society which cannot be rendered available in agriculture." William Gregg considered that significant. He pointed out to Freeman Hunt that "a large portion of our poor white people are not only unproduc-

<sup>56</sup> James H. Taylor, "Address," in *Constitution of the South-Carolina Institute*, 22.

<sup>57</sup> Lumpkin, "Industrial Regeneration of the South," *loc. cit.*, 47.

<sup>58</sup> Cited in *Farmer and Mechanic*, New Series, IV (1850), 317.

<sup>59</sup> Taylor, "Manufactures in South Carolina," *loc. cit.*, 26.

tive, but actually a burthen to us.”<sup>60</sup> The cotton mills came within the scope of poor relief, but their place in southern life emanated from the nature of the industry itself. In the South it is an industry which lingers in the rural setting of its inception and bears witness to its close affinity to agricultural life. The cotton mill crusaders detected in the South the human and material qualifications for a cotton textile industry. They added flavor and color to southern industrialization by incorporating therein the sense of a mission to uplift as did New England manufacturers when they built boarding houses for female operatives.

The crusade to bring the cotton mills to the cotton fields served, in the long run, to propel sectional patriotism along the road to cultural autonomy where the southern states would “no longer be tributary to the other states of this Union.”<sup>61</sup> It was a road which carried an assortment of traffic. Of the many signposts, those which pointed in the direction of industrialization were neat but small. But size does not always account for vociferousness. Those who were in the vanguard of the cotton mill crusade and who preached the industrial gospel, before it was overwhelmingly received later in the century, never tired of urging Southerners to abandon old habits, to divorce themselves from an exclusively agricultural economy, and to take inventory of their potentialities for manufacturing enterprise.

There seemed to be no end to formulas and arguments to encourage the transition. But as the cotton mill crusade of the last two decades of the century was to demonstrate, the community had first to be enlightened; public opinion had to be formed; old prejudices had to be dissolved; new ideas in support of new ways of acting had to be engendered. In order to substantiate these ambitions and to translate aspirations into practical and visible results, men, women, and children had to be induced (although many solicited work) into cotton mill schemes which were calculated to bring changes in the established pursuits of the community. The living minds of the people had to be

<sup>60</sup> *Hunt's Merchants' Magazine*, XXII (1850), 108. See also, James H. Hammond, *An Address Delivered before the South-Carolina Institute at Its First Annual Fair, November 20, 1849* (Charleston, 1850), 33-34.

<sup>61</sup> *De Bow's Review*, X (1851), 215.

brought into contact with machines and factories. Through the agency of voluntary associations the entire community was frequently mobilized in order to effectuate that concert of action which cotton mill projects necessitated.

Thus the industrial gospel which developed before 1860 should perhaps be considered as the prelude to the wave of cotton mill building which descended upon the South after 1880. It was the profile of the full face of industrial expansion; it was the small voice of an industrial movement, which, when once it won recruits and propagators, was preached by a crescendo of voices, with the result that at the beginning of the twentieth century every town or village of any size in the South seemed determined to have a cotton mill of its own.<sup>62</sup>

<sup>62</sup> See *Commercial and Financial Chronicle* (New York, 1865- ), LXXIII (1901), Special Supplement of September 7, 1901, p. 6.

# Notes and Documents

## THE FIGHT TO DEPOSE GOVERNOR FRANCIS NICHOLSON—

JAMES BLAIR'S AFFIDAVIT OF JUNE 7, 1704

EDITED BY SAMUEL CLYDE MCCULLOCH

The attempt to strengthen and increase royal control of the American colonies at the end of the seventeenth century<sup>1</sup> incited inevitable resistance in the colonists, and although the ruling class in Virginia preferred royal government to proprietary rule, they resented any serious challenge to their rights and privileges. These great planters, independent and proud, were also split into cliques, all of which had to be skillfully pacified by the governor. The position of royal governor of Virginia was therefore one which required diplomatic finesse of a high order. Francis Nicholson did not possess this qualification when he came to Virginia in 1698; and for the next seven years he was continuously embroiled in disputes with the great planters, who, by joining forces with the Commissary James Blair faction, were finally able to obtain his recall.

At the time of his appointment to the governorship of Virginia, Nicholson was already a seasoned administrator, equipped with a broad view of colonial affairs which he had acquired by holding various positions in the colonies. During the early years of his service to the Crown, he had been lieutenant governor of the Dominion of New England (1688) and of Virginia (1692-1694), and immediately before he came to Virginia for the second time in December, 1698, he was governor of the colony of Maryland. In spite of the stormy nature of

<sup>1</sup> George H. Guttridge, *The Colonial Policy of William III in America and the West Indies* (Cambridge, 1922), *passim*.

his second residence in Virginia, his altercations with Blair and the planters, and his ignominious recall, his prestige as a representative of the Crown in the New World was not diminished in the eyes of the Board of Trade, and they gave him other official positions in the colonies, including a third governorship in 1720. He died at this post in South Carolina.<sup>2</sup>

In carrying out his orders as governor, Nicholson clashed with the Council, a body composed almost solely of great planters.<sup>3</sup> He had to report all arrears of quitrents and the names of persons possessing over 20,000 acres of land. He attempted to enforce his instructions that naval officers and collectors should not be the same persons and that neither should be on the Council, a policy which could not have been better calculated to arouse the Council's ire. He also tried to force Virginia to co-operate in a plan of Empire defense. By 1702, relations between the governor and the Council were strained, and the pressure was not diminished by Nicholson's romantic fiasco with Lucy Burwell. When Major Lewis Burwell's daughter refused the governor's impassioned pleas for marriage, Nicholson insulted her powerful parents and relatives. It is evident that Nicholson was subject to violent outbursts of uncontrollable rage when anyone opposed him, and his vocabulary during these wrathful times was rich and varied. The Council, therefore, while peevishly resenting some of Nicholson's measures, justly found his abusive language and conduct intolerable, and at last the accumulation of valid and invalid irritations aroused some members to open hostility. Finally, Nicholson also made the fatal mistake of tangling with Blair, who, more than anybody else, had been responsible for Sir Edmund Andros' recall,<sup>4</sup> and who was to bring a third governor of Virginia, Alexander Spotswood, to a similar defeat.

Although Blair was a Scot, he had taken orders in the Church of

<sup>2</sup> See the sketch of Nicholson, by Leonard W. Labaree, in Allen Johnson and Dumas Malone (eds.), *Dictionary of American Biography*, 20 vols. and index (New York, 1928-1937), XIII, 499-501.

<sup>3</sup> Henry R. McIlwaine (ed.), *Executive Journals of the Council of Colonial Virginia*, 4 vols. (Richmond, 1925-1930), I and II, *passim*.

<sup>4</sup> Louis B. Wright, "William Byrd's Defense of Sir Edmund Andros," in *William and Mary Quarterly* (Williamsburg, 1892- ), Ser. 3, Vol. II (1945), 47-62.



England, and in 1685, Henry Compton, Bishop of London, sent him as a missionary to Virginia, which was a part of the Bishop's diocese. In 1689, Blair was appointed the Bishop's personal representative, or "commissary."<sup>5</sup> The office was supposed to give Blair all the powers of a resident bishop, with the exception of ordination and confirmation, but in practice he was the mere shadow of a bishop. Besides having no real disciplinary authority, he could neither suspend nor remove delinquent ministers. The governor and Council could suspend ministers, but removals could only be made by the Assembly. Moreover, the governor, as the supreme ordinary, had the right of inducting ministers, presented by the vestries, into their ministries.<sup>6</sup> An inducted minister could then consider his living permanent. Actually, ministers seldom received induction, because the governor allowed the vestries to control appointments, a situation which infuriated Blair, and lead to a protracted quarrel with all of Virginia's governors.

Blair's position as commissary was strengthened on July 18, 1694, when through the King's influence he became a member of the Council.<sup>7</sup> Here he so antagonized Governor Andros and some of his fellow members, that he was suspended from that body (1695-1696), and was only restored by the King's order.<sup>8</sup> Nicholson did not make him one of his original Council members, and not until the King directed his admission was Blair made a member in 1701.<sup>9</sup> The fact, too, that Blair was president of the College of William and Mary increased the area of conflict with Nicholson, for the governor now opposed many of Blair's policies, where formerly during his first administration, he

<sup>5</sup> For a well-balanced sketch of Blair's career, see *Dictionary of American Biography*, II, 335-37. Daniel Esten Motley, *Life of Commissary James Blair*, in the *Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science*, Ser. XIX, No. 10 (Baltimore, 1901), is unsatisfactory. A good account of Blair's early life and his activities as president of the College of William and Mary is to be found in G. MacLaren Brydon, "James Blair, Commissary," in *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church* (Richmond, 1932- ), XIV (1945), 85-118.

<sup>6</sup> Philip A. Bruce, *Institutional History of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century*, 2 vols. (New York, 1910), I, 131-44.

<sup>7</sup> McIlwaine (ed.), *Executive Journals of Virginia Council*, I, 314.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 324.

<sup>9</sup> *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series*, 40 vols. (London, 1860-1939), Vol. XVIII, *America and the West Indies, 1700*, 771; *ibid.*, Vol. XIX, 1701, 290.

had supported the commissary. Intelligent, strong-minded, and energetic, but stubborn and irascible, Blair made all those who opposed him his violent enemies. And he and Nicholson agreed on few things.

As early as 1702 Blair revealed his disapproval of Nicholson's administration in a letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury. "Instead of the Halcyon days we promised ourselves under his government," he wrote, "we never had near so much storm & tempest, tornado's & Huracanes as in that time. He governs us as if we were a company of Galley slaves by continual roaring & thundering, cursing & swearing, base, abusive, billingsgate Language."<sup>10</sup> And in that same year Blair sent a "Memorial against Governor Nicholson" to the Bishop of London, which spoke of the governor's arbitrary rule, terrible temper and language, and dishonest actions. "I really came at last to consider him," Blair concluded, "as a man of the blackest soul & conscience that I had ever known in my life."<sup>11</sup>

By 1703, Nicholson's actions had so goaded some of the Council, including Blair, that a lengthy "memorial" containing charges of maladministration was drawn up and signed on May 20 by John Lightfoot, Matthew Page, Benjamin Harrison, Robert Carter, James Blair, and Philip Ludwell. The accusations were divided under four headings: "His behavior in the Council"; "His behavior in the Upper House of Assembly"; "His behavior in the General Courts"; and "Other Publick Abuses in his Government." The charges were seldom supported by evidence, and an inordinate emphasis was placed on the governor's personal misconduct.<sup>12</sup> A year later the contents of this "memorial" were repeated more effectively in Blair's affidavit of June 7, 1704.

Nicholson learned that Blair constantly bombarded his influential friends in England with letters criticizing the governor, and in August, 1703, Nicholson complained that Blair was misrepresenting his ac-

<sup>10</sup> William S. Perry (ed.), *Historical Collections Relating to the American Colonial Church*, 5 vols. (Hartford, 1870-1878), I, 125.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 75-80.

<sup>12</sup> "Charges against Governor Nicholson," in *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* (Richmond, 1893- ), III (1896), 373-82.

tions.<sup>13</sup> Colonel Robert Quarry, surveyor-general of customs in America, immediately defended Nicholson in a letter of October 15 to the Board of Trade, whose contents bespoke a knowledge of the existence of the "memorial" of May 20.<sup>14</sup> Indeed, Quarry, a close friend of Nicholson, had constantly defended his actions to the Board,<sup>15</sup> and on October 15 he also wrote a letter of defense to the Bishop of London, in which, after praising Nicholson's acts and criticizing Blair's inconsistencies, he even asked the Bishop to reprove the commissary.<sup>16</sup>

Ten months after the petition had been drawn up by the six members of the Council, it was presented to the Queen.<sup>17</sup> Meanwhile Blair, who had come to London to press the charges, had drawn up two separate statements and had obtained affidavits in support of the accusations from Stephen Fouace, James Wallace, Robert Beverley, Captain James Moody, and others whom Nicholson had offended. Blair probably realized that the generalities of the "memorial" needed buttressing with specific details of Nicholson's conduct. The affidavits of Moody<sup>18</sup> and Fouace<sup>19</sup> recorded detailed accounts of Nicholson's insulting behavior toward themselves and the best gentlemen of Virginia. Another separate affidavit by Fouace printed letters from such men as Philip Ludwell, Benjamin Harrison, Major Lewis Burwell, and others, whose contents substantiated other accusations in the memorial.<sup>20</sup> But the most comprehensive affidavits were made by Blair himself.

Dated April 25, 1704, the first affidavit, according to Blair, was an amplification of several of the memorial's articles, together with additional material. Although concentrating on presenting instances of

<sup>13</sup> *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series*, Vol. XXI, *America and the West Indies*, December 1, 1702-1703, 656.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, 733-34.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, 13, 731.

<sup>16</sup> Perry (ed.), *Historical Collections*, I, 82-87.

<sup>17</sup> *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series*, Vol. XXII, *America and the West Indies*, 1704-1705, 86.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, 111. For Beverley's affidavit, see *ibid.*, 104, and for his later indictment of Nicholson, see his *The History and Present State of Virginia* (London, 1705), *passim*.

<sup>19</sup> Perry (ed.), *Historical Collections*, I, 87-93.

<sup>20</sup> *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series*, Vol. XXII, *America and the West Indies*, 1704-1705, 105-110.

Nicholson's misuse of power, it was characterized by many unqualified statements. The affidavit of June 7 provides little more damning material and many more qualifications. Blair delighted in speaking of Nicholson's contempt for the law, and cited one instance when the governor swore he would hang some people with "Magna Charta about their Necks."<sup>21</sup>

The second affidavit, dated May 1, 1704, related to the clergy, the college, and himself. In substance, Blair claimed that Nicholson abused his rights of induction, of issuing marriage licenses, and of conducting probates; called meetings of the clergy without Blair's permission; insulted the clergy many times, once saying that "they were all a pack of scoundrels" and that he wished they were dead; threw ridicule and abuse on the college; acted many times without the trustees' consent, and blocked the college revenues whenever possible; and, finally, interfered with Blair's private affairs and even tried to injure him bodily.

The last-named charge cited two very inconclusive incidents. The first involved a student prank. It had been the custom just before the Christmas holidays, Blair said, to keep the masters out of the students' quarters by barricading the door, and firing pistols (loaded only with powder) until the masters promised a longer holiday. Two weeks before Christmas, 1702, continued Blair, he was "mightily surprised" to hear the boys barricading the doors, for he had "banished this custom." Assisted by two servants, he commenced to break in, but the boys fired several pistols, hitting one of the servants in the eye with a wad. Infuriated, Blair pressed on, only to be warned emphatically by the boys that they had lead shot, and would fire on the first person who entered. Immediately Blair suspected that his "malicious neighbour" was mixed up in the affair. The very next day, Blair said, one of the boys admitted that Nicholson had put them up to the whole business, and had given them "money to buy victuals & drink & Candles, & Powder, & Shot, & lent them 6 of his own Pistols." The second incident involved an early morning intruder who tried to break into Blair's bedroom, and the

<sup>21</sup> Perry (ed.), *Historical Collections*, I, 93-112.

commissary learned the next morning that Nicholson had been seen walking towards Blair's house that night in a terrible tantrum.<sup>22</sup>

A few weeks after this second affidavit had been presented, John Thrale, Nicholson's London agent, submitted an answer to the various charges of maladministration. But Thrale did not make a convincing case. Usually he insisted that the charges were too general; or he would say that Nicholson acted like any other governor, or that the accusations were on the person of the governor, not on his administration. Once, with superb understatement, Thrale admitted that Nicholson was "not a man incapable of being raised to a Passion." Finally, he asked that all affidavits be sent to Virginia, so that Nicholson could prepare a just defense.<sup>23</sup>

Thrale's charge that the accusations were too general was answered in Blair's third affidavit, that of June 7, 1704. This is the most important of the group, because it concisely sums up all the charges against Nicholson and gives ample proof for each one. As evidence, therefore, it is the weightiest document, and the most telling in the case against Nicholson.

On June 13, 1704, the Board of Trade recommended to the Queen that the "memorial" and all the affidavits be sent to Virginia, so that Nicholson should have a fair chance to defend himself, and that testimonies and affidavits should be collected in Virginia, both "accusa-

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 131-38. Just how inconclusive were these two last incidents was proved several years later, in 1727, by a pamphlet, undoubtedly written by Nicholson, entitled *Papers Relating to an Affidavit Made by His Reverence James Blair . . . against Francis Nicholson, Esq.* (The only original copy of this work in America is in the John Carter Brown Library, Brown University.) The work opens by printing the section of the affidavit describing these two incidents, then follows it by sworn declarations from many students, and three masters, proving that the "Barring Out" was not dangerous, and that the servant hit by the wad was frightened, not hurt. Evidence is likewise produced to prove the exaggeration and stupidity of the second incident. The pamphlet also disproves a charge that Nicholson showed irresponsibility in issuing marriage licenses. The remainder of the pamphlet prints letters and other evidence in praise of Nicholson. These, while seemingly vindicating Nicholson's character and administrative efficiency, do not disprove the remainder of the charges in Blair's affidavit. The pamphlet incorrectly gives the date of this affidavit as May 10, 1704.

<sup>23</sup> "Papers Relating to the Administration of Governor Nicholson and to the Founding of William and Mary College," in *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, VII (1900), 278-82, 386-91.

tions against Colonel Nicholson or tending to his vindication." The governor was "not to overawe or discourage any testimony or evidence in these matters," and if he wished he could come to England to clear himself.<sup>24</sup> Two days later the Queen ordered these recommendations carried into effect.<sup>25</sup>

Nicholson tried to defend himself in long letters written to the Board of Trade on March 1, 2, 3, and 6, 1705. Time and again he affirms that certain charges are untrue, but fails to offer enough substantiating evidence. "They have observed to a tittle," he wrote in one letter, "the old Diabolical saying vizt. Fling dirt enough and some will stick." However, he attached copies of addresses, memorandums, certificates, copies of Council minutes, and transcripts of letters. His main plea was that he had fully carried out his instructions, and he concluded one letter by expressing determination to clear himself, "to vindicate honour and reputation, and if absolutely necessary so to do it, to spend the last penny of my blood, for I value these above my estate and equal to my life."<sup>26</sup>

His defense was not made in time. An order for his recall was issued on April 12, 1705, and on April 17, Governor Edward Nott was appointed to succeed him.<sup>27</sup> Nicholson sailed for England in late July or early August, though not before he had written a determined letter to the Board of Trade insisting that he was coming immediately to defend himself, and bringing all the proofs he could lay his hands on.<sup>28</sup> He even petitioned that Blair not be permitted to return to Virginia until he had completely proved his charges.<sup>29</sup> The fact, however, that Nicholson had been deposed from his office, was a triumph for Blair and his fellow opponents.

Nevertheless, the evidence does not indicate that a majority of Virginians were opposed to Nicholson. It is notable that in the contro-

<sup>24</sup> *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series*, Vol. XXII, *America and the West Indies, 1704-1705*, 166.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, 168.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, 397-402, 403-406, 411-28, 429-37.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, 480, 485.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, 594-97.

<sup>29</sup> *Acts of the Privy Council, Colonial Series* (London, 1908- ), II (1910), 487.

versy well over half the members of the House of Burgesses sympathized with him. This fact ought not to be neglected when assessing the governor's sins. On May 1, Nicholson sent an urgent and eloquent message to the House, which gave a resumé of the case against himself and appealed forcefully for a fair opinion of his administration. "I would rather lie in a gaol and live upon bread and water an honest man," he said, "than to have the greatest honor and estate in the world and to be such a man as they have represented me."<sup>30</sup>

On the morning of May 4, the day set aside for the discussion of the message, John Lightfoot, Robert Carter, and Philip Ludwell appeared before the House door, and asked permission to present their side of the question before the House considered the governor's message. They were refused. They then wrote a letter; but it, too, was refused a reading. All that day the governor's message with its accompanying papers was hotly debated. At last a resolution was adopted, by a vote of twenty-seven to eighteen, that Nicholson had shown a great respect for the welfare and prosperity of the colony, and "that the better part of her Majesty's good and loyal subjects here are not of the same sentiments with that part of the Council which have accused his Excellency of Mal-administration." The matter was concluded on the following day when six further resolutions were adopted, to be construed as a vote of confidence for Nicholson. The last of these resolutions was the most important: "That whosoever pretends to take upon himself to represent the country in general under any grievance or pressure without the consent and authority of this house so to do, is thereby guilty of an unwarrantable act tending to the prejudice of the country."<sup>31</sup> Obviously, the House felt that the six members of the Council had acted with grave discourtesy.

A majority of the clergy were also in favor of Nicholson, and signed a paper indicating their support.<sup>32</sup> Those loyal to Blair accused these signers of being won over by the governor's flattery, receptions, and

<sup>30</sup> Henry R. McIlwaine (ed.), *Journals of the House of Burgesses of Virginia, 1702/3 . . . 1712* (Richmond, 1912), 101-102.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, 107-108.

<sup>32</sup> Motley, *Life of Blair*, 51; Perry (ed.), *Historical Collections*, I, 141-42.

gifts. Indeed, Blair had almost more than he could handle when, at a general meeting on August 29 and 30, 1705, he pleaded that bygones should be bygones, and that they should "forgive and forget" their differences about Nicholson. A large proportion of the clergy expressed their disapproval of Blair, and indicated that he ought to change his ways if he wished to be popular.<sup>33</sup>

Even within the faculty ranks of the College itself, there was a supporter of Nicholson. One of Blair's most acrimonious feuds was with Mungo Ingles, a fellow Scot and a master at the College, who sided with the governor. Ingles accused Blair of many high-handed and selfish actions, and resigned in 1705 because of the friction.<sup>34</sup> It is necessary, therefore, to examine closely the charges brought against Nicholson in order to ascertain their real worth.

In analyzing these charges, it is clear that the governor aroused violent opposition to almost anything he undertook. Only men whose hostility had been aroused over a great many things could have drawn up such a "memorial," and written such affidavits. Nor did they point to one particular grievance, but comprehensively surveyed many. Blair, especially, tried to judge the motives behind every one of Nicholson's actions and, by sometimes mistaking such motives, opened himself to inconsistency. Blair's argument against Andros and Nicholson was essentially the same—that they altered the constitution of the government by assuming dictatorial authority. Yet in several cases Nicholson was damned for doing the very things that Blair had attacked Andros for neglecting. Evidently the governors were given little choice between sins of commission and those of omission. In 1697, Blair accused Andros of neglecting to assemble the militia.<sup>35</sup> In 1704, he accused Nicholson of mustering it too frequently and making militia service too difficult.<sup>36</sup> In 1697, he complained that Andros had opened up the

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 142-78.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 137-38; "Papers Relating to the Administration of Governor Nicholson and to the Founding of William and Mary College," *loc. cit.*, 391-93.

<sup>35</sup> Hunter D. Farish (ed.), *The Present State of Virginia and the College*, By Henry Hartwell, James Blair, and Edward Chilton (Williamsburg, 1940), 63.

<sup>36</sup> Article 16 of Blair's Affidavit of June 7, 1704.



Pamunkey Neck and Blackwater lands.<sup>37</sup> In 1704, he complained that Nicholson had closed these lands.<sup>38</sup> In truth, Blair and his friends saw an evil design behind any action of the governor. Quarry went further when he denounced them as "a set of men who for 20 years have been of a sour and uneasy temper, clamoring against each successive governor."<sup>39</sup>

Of prime importance is the fact that the charges also revealed a fundamental difference between Nicholson and his opponents in conception of government. The latter clearly felt that the governor was being arbitrary in considering the Council a subordinate body to be consulted for advice only, and not as a body whose advice must be sought and taken in all public matters, and which was created as a check on the governor. Nicholson, on the other hand, could not deny the general charges of so-called maladministration, because he felt that his actions were not only justified, but required by his instructions from the Board of Trade. In recalling Nicholson, that body was not necessarily condemning him for executive excesses, nor was it withdrawing from its recently formulated policy of stronger home government. The fact that it gave the governorship of Virginia to Nott before receiving Nicholson's defense is a sign that it was yielding to a political group whose importance it could not afford to ignore and with whom Nicholson had not been able to cope because of the lack of statesmanship and tact. His subsequent appointment to the governorship of South Carolina should perhaps be interpreted as an indication that the Board of Trade was still of the opinion that he was a conscientious and faithful representative of the Crown.

The Blair affidavit of June 7, 1704, is of great value in this controversy, therefore, because more than any other document, it sums up

<sup>37</sup> Perry (ed.), *Historical Collections*, I, 36-65; Farish (ed.), *Present State of Virginia*, 71.

<sup>38</sup> Article 1 of Blair's Affidavit of June 7, 1704.

<sup>39</sup> *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series*, Vol. XXII, *America and the West Indies, 1704-1705*, 647. One of Nicholson's particular opponents was William Byrd, although he did not sign the "memorial." See Louis B. Wright, "William Byrd's Opposition to Governor Francis Nicholson," in *Journal of Southern History* (Baton Rouge, 1935- ), XI (1945), 68-79.

the charges against Nicholson, and cites more specific evidence than do all the others put together. So far as can be determined, this affidavit has never been referred to in any accounts which deal with Blair or Nicholson, and the only printed version of it is an incomplete and unsatisfactory digest in the *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series*, Volume XXII, *America and the West Indies, 1704-1705* (pp. 158-59). The document is in the manuscripts of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts (Unbound Letters, Virginia, pp. 137-52), photostats of which are in the Library of Congress. In presenting it here, Blair's manuscript has been transcribed literally, except for the reduction of superior letters and the expansion of contractions common in manuscripts of that period. In several instances, also, eccentric punctuation has been changed to prevent misreading.

---

THE AFFIDAVIT OF JAMES BLAIR, CLERK, JUNE 7, 1704

In compliance with your Lordships' directions, I have upon perusal of the Minutes of Council, and of the Upper House of Assembly, for the time that I have been upon the Council, observed some instances and examples of those things which were more generally charged in the articles against Governor Nicholson, which accordingly I do here present to your Lordships, in the method of the abstract lately exhibited.

Article 1. Instances of the first Article wherein he is charged as acting without advice of Council in matters of the greatest moment are these that follow, vizt.—

I find 3 Naval Officers nominated by him since I came last upon the Council, all without advice of Council, contrary to both law and instruction. These three are Mr. Hancock Custis, Council Books 1699, page 36;<sup>40</sup> Mr. Gowin Corbin, *ibid.*, page 75; and Major Arthur Allen put in on or about April 24, 1703. But not mentioned in the Council Books, not so much as for taking the oaths to the government at the entering upon his office, as the others are; he was likewise allowed to officiate his place by a deputy without advice of Council. At the same time Captain Nathaniel Harrison to make way for this Major Allen, was without any fault alleged or proved against him, removed from his Naval Officers place, without advice of Council.

Another instance of this Article is that the Governor has issued many war-

<sup>40</sup> Since the original executive journals of the Virginia Council have long since disappeared (See McIlwaine [ed.], *Executive Journals of Virginia Council*, I, vi), it has not been possible to check all of Blair's citations against the printed edition. Those which could be checked have been found accurate.

rants upon the revenue, without consent of Council, and against instruction; particularly to Mr. Dionysius Wright sixty pounds, Council Book No. 3, April 25, 1702. And messengers and contingent charges in several articles in half a year's time, two hundred and sixteen pounds, three shillings, *ibid.*, April 24th, 1703; more instances of these warrants may be seen Council Book 1699, page 72, and April 25th, 1702 and October 27th, 1702. In all which places they are said to be signed by the Governor in Council, but are not said to have been read or approved of by them, as I do positively remember of the article of Mr. Wright, and some other articles that they were not read, nor communicated to the Council.

Another instance is in Patents for Land passed without consent of Council, though perhaps they were signed by the Governor in Council without being read, several of which are mentioned, Council Book No. 3, page 19, and April 24th, 1703.

Another instance is in Justices of Peace, Sheriffs, Militia Officers, and Clerks. Examples of these turned out by the Governor without advice of Council are mentioned in the affidavit, vizt. Captain George Marable, and Mr. Wm. Drummond, and the Court of Nanzemond, whose names I find not, but remember Colonel Nasworthy, Dr. Luke Havill, and Major Thomas Swann, and Captain Henry Jenkins were four of them, being four of the ablest men of the country. John Walker, Sheriff of King and Queen County, was arbitrarily removed by the Governor in the middle of his collection. The Clerks I remember to have been turned out were Mr. Daniel Sullivan, Mr. John Taylor, and Mr. Robert Beverly. I could name a great many of the Justices, Sheriffs, Militia Officers and Clerks that were put in without advice of Council, but, the matter of fact being owned, it is superfluous. Only that the practice was otherwise in the time of former governments may be seen in the Council Minutes of those Governor's times, particularly of late in all Sir Edmund Andros's time, and even in this Governor's time, Council Book No. 3, page 3, and August 27th, 1702.

Another instance is in the Governor's nomination of Agents for the country, paid out of the revenue without advice of Council. Examples of this are Mr. Thrale, October 27th, 1702, page 17, and Mr. Wright, No. 3, April 25th, 1702, and in the Governor's refusing to consent to the pay of an Agent named by the General Assembly, May 9th, 1699, page 56.

Another instance is in the publishing of proclamations without advice of Council, of which, though there are a great many, I remember only two. One was giving notice that the land on Pamunkey Neck, and on the south side of Blackwater should be opened to none but such as should seat in other places of the frontiers, according to a Frontier Act, which proclamation was not only without but contrary to the advice of the Council in the year 1699, page 65. The other was a proclamation to prorogue an Assembly in the year 1701 or 1702, upon which occasion the Governor called three of the Council to meet

at Colonel Dukes before he was of the Council, vizt. Colonel Jennings, Colonel Lightfoot, and myself. But, bringing the proclamations with him ready drawn and signed, without communicating anything of the matter to us, he called for a candle and sealed them up in covers to the several Sheriffs and sent them away. At this meeting of the Council there was not so much as a Clerk present, or any minute taken.

Another instance is in his countermanding by his own authority what had been enjoined and published by Governor and Council, an example of which I remember in his shutting up of the Blackwater land after it had been opened by order of himself and Council, published by proclamation August 23, 1702, page 7.

Article 2. Instances of the second Article, wherein he is charged as signing papers in Council on purpose to have the color of the Council's name, without having them read or communicated to the Council, are August 23rd, 1702, page 19, when he signed many patents in Council, and April 24th, 1703, when he signed many patents and Sheriffs' commissions in the General Court, besides the warrants for money to Mr. Dionysius Wright, and others signed in Council April 25th, 1702 and all the other above mentioned warrants.

Article 3. As to the third Article, wherein he is charged as taking away from the Council the inspecting and auditing the accounts of the revenue, and sending home the said accounts without any check or voucher in that country, I must observe to your Lordships that in my search of the Council Minutes for the whole time since I have been upon the Council, which is about four years, I find no mention made of any one audit of the said accounts by the Council.

Article 4. As to the fourth Article wherein he is charged with destroying all just freedom of dispute or debate in Council, by his usual hectoring, brow beating and threatening those of the Council who differ in opinion from him. This being an unusual practice it would be a lessening of the charge to give a few instances yet for your Lordships' satisfaction. I shall mention two or three several times which are still fresh in my memory. One was September 5th, 1701 against Colonel Carter, Colonel Harrison and myself concerning some amendments of a Militia Bill, the Governor pretending to have the bill so worded as to enable him to make use of the Militia of Virginia for his Majesty's Service in any part of the world, and we pretending that the Militia was to be kept for the defense of the country, or that if upon particular occasions they were to be exported to other countries such exportation must be by particular acts to defray the charges thereof, suitable to the said occasions. Another example was of his abusing the whole Council August 26, 1702, concerning the refusing of ten thousand pounds of tobacco to the speaker. A third, a gross abuse of myself in the business of Mr. Wallace, Council Book, October 24th, 1702, page 23.

Article 5. As to the instances of the fifth Article, wherein he is charged as putting many things into the Minutes and records of Council without the Coun-

cil's advice or consent and causing several things to be chopped and changed afterwards without their privity.

As to the first part of this charge, there is a great number of instances of papers of his own which he brings in ready drawn into Council, telling the Council they are things he intends to do, without asking their advice about them. He makes the Clerk read these and afterwards has them entered as done by advice and consent of Council; of this sort there is an order about musters every fortnight, Council Book, May 9th, 1699, page 25, and about the fifth men, page 26, and several propositions said to be sent by the Governor and Council to the revisors of the laws, page 29, and many other of that nature.

As for alterations of Minutes, examples are to be found, Council Book, May 9th, 1699, page 65, concerning a proclamation for bestowing the Blackwater and Pamunkey lands only on such as should seat according to the Frontier Act, quite contrary to the unanimous opinion of the Council; and No. 3, page 17, the question being concerning the choosing Mr. Thrall for Agent, there is no notice taken of the Council's refusing of him; and page 19, Mr. Wallace's answer which he gave in writing is not there set down, but another very different from it; and page 30, my Lord Cornbury's receipt for the Governor's nine hundred pound bills, is mentioned as ordered to be put upon the Council Books, yet it doth nowhere appear in these books. If it had it would have been seen that my Lord Cornbury was not to make use of the Governor's bills unless the Queen should first allow the Governor the money out of the quitrents of Virginia. And page 400 there is an order for writs for Prince George's County which ought to have been for Charles City County, Prince George's County having at that time two burgesses and Charles City none. There are other instances of alterations, which I omit for brevity's sake, only it is very remarkable that in that long Assembly [of] 1701 the Governor is never marked in the Minutes as present with the Council, but when the House of Burgesses was called up or when a particular message from them was directed to him, whereas he was continually present and presided in all the meetings of the Council.

It is fit likewise upon this Article to observe to your Lordships that the Minutes of Council are very seldom read over in Council and that the Governor keeps the Clerk of the Council in his service and pay, by which he has the greater opportunity to overawe and influence him in the entries which he makes in the Council Books.

Article 6. As to the sixth Article, wherein he is charged as having encroached on the liberties of the upper house of the Assembly, instances of this are:

In his being continually present and presiding in that house.

His hectoring and browbeating in several businesses before them, particularly in the Militia Bill, September 5, 1701, and the speaker's tobacco, August 26 and 27, 1702.

In his sending answers of his own to messages brought up from the House of Burgesses to the Council, as may be seen, Council in Assembly, September, 1701, page 79, which they resent, pages 80 and 81, for many reasons there set down, as being against the privilege of Assembly, against their engagements, and hazarding a rupture; and page 86, the Burgesses sending a message to the Council about the Book of Claims the Governor always answers it himself without giving the Council leave to answer; and August 26 and 27, 1702, the Governor's remonstrance and reasons against the Council's opinion sent to the House of Burgesses about the speaker's tobacco.

In his threatening of the members with ruin and cutting of their throats if they vote not as he would have them. An example is in Colonel Lightfoot, who was so threatened, not to mention the Speaker of the House of Burgesses and six or seven Clerks more who were threatened to be turned out if they did not vote as he would have them in the Assembly [of] 1700, and accordingly had blank commissions drawn for their places.

Article 7. As to the seventh Article, wherein he is charged with obstructing the due course of law by his abuses to parties, lawyers and judges, though the instances are very many I shall content myself with a few.

In the case of Mr. John Dawzy about land, he abused him grossly, upbraiding him with his country, for he was a German naturalized, and threw out his business in passion without asking any advice of the rest of the court.

In the case of Captain James Bray, about sending of seconds, he pleaded against him from the bench more like a party than a judge, and flew into great heats and passions.

The instance upon which I shall be most particular is one that happened April 17th, 1703, in a case of detinue between Swan and Willson, in which he did so grossly abuse Mr. Benjamin Harrison, who was counsel for Swan, that everybody cried shame of it. I can give the better account of it because I set it down in writing when I went home out of the Court, while it was yet fresh in my memory. Swan had sued Willson for taking by force and detaining from him an horse and pistol, and the matter being put to a jury they found against Willson and gave Swan damages. One Mr. Hollaway, counsel for Virginia, pleaded in arrest of judgment an error of the declaration, vizt. that Swan had not set forth his right and property in the said horse and pistol, saying only an horse and pistol whereas he ought to have said his own horse and pistol, and produced a law book wherein after the verdict of a jury in England judgment was stopped for want of the word *suum* in a declaration wherein it should have been *equum suum*. To this Mr. Harrison replied that it had never been the practice of that Court to admit of pleas against the forms of declarations after the verdict of a jury, but that all such pleas were to be put in before the jury went out. The Governor, without any other provocation, with a high, thundering voice, fell upon him in these words, "Sir, are you the Queen's Council and

pretend to set up a precedent in Virginia contrary to the practice of England? But it is like you, Sir; sometimes we must have all according to the law of England, and sometimes none; one day we must have no Court at all, and at another time a County Court shall take a man's ears. Sir, you shan't impose upon me with your tricks and equivocations." To which Mr. Harrison replied, "May it please your Excellency, for what I say here I am under the correction of the Court, but there I gave my opinion as a judge, and did it to the best of my knowledge and conscience." Governor (in a violent passion), "The country has been ruined by you, Sir, and you think to set up against me everywhere, and make mischief, but I'll mark you and expose you," or words to that effect. Upon which Mr. Harrison, seeing the Governor in so great passion, was modestly silent, and the whole Court being likewise in profound silence and all business at a full stop for near a quarter of an hour, that being the third day of the Court's sitting and the Governor having abused Mr. Harrison every one of these days. I, being one of the judges, thought it high time to say something to put a stop to such unfair proceedings, knowing that Mr. Harrison was employed at that time in a great many people's business, and, having deliberately considered what I was to say, rose up and taking off my hat applied myself to the Governor in these words: Blair, "May it please your Excellency, if Mr. Harrison has done any ill thing for which he is accountable, I hope your Excellency will find another time to call him to an account for it. I am sorry to see so much of the Court's time taken up and Mr. Harrison's clients, who are innocent, suffer so much in their business by reason of your Excellency's prejudices against him." Governor (with a very high voice), "Sir, I deny the prejudice, put it down in writing." Blair, "I hope I have liberty here to speak my opinion." Governor, "I command you, Sir, to put it in writing." Blair, "Sir, I am not afraid to put it in writing, but I say again I have a right to speak my opinion." Governor, "Who hinders you? Neither you nor he shall think to hector me." Blair, "Sir, it is far from my thoughts. I wish there were no such thing as hectoring, especially in this place; I believe one-third part of our time this Court, has been spent in this sort of employment. I am ashamed to sit here and see the people so used." Governor, "Get you gone then. It had been good for the country if they had never seen your face." Blair, "I could answer your Excellency if you were in another station." Governor, "I wish we were both together in England." Blair, "I wish so too." Governor, "I will go with you next shipping." Blair, "I wish you would be as good as your word." Governor, "Go when you will, I will follow you."

Article 8. As to the eighth Article, wherein he is charged as giving directions to the Sheriffs about the packing of Grand Juries contrary to law, the Sheriff to whom orders were given about the putting in of some and putting out of others was Mr. Henry Tyler. One of the persons struck out was Mr. John Walker. The fine I mention to be remitted was to Major Waller.

The Naval officer's place was given to Major Allen, foreman, taken from Captain Nathaniel Harrison.

Article 9. As to the ninth Article, wherein he is charged as giving arbitrary and vexatious commands for the attendance of men's persons, backing them with the authority of Her Majesty's name, instances of this are already in the affidavits in Mr. Wallace, who was sent for forty miles off and obliged to attend several days; Major Swan, who was sent for thirty miles off and over a great river; Colonel Ludwell and myself have been very often sent for only to be scolded at and abused.

Article 10. As to the tenth Article, wherein he is charged with calling courts to inquire into the lives and conversations of such men as he intends to expose or ruin, when there is no accusation or accuser, the instances of this are of a Court called at Kiquotan against Captain Moody and Mr. Wallace, and another at Nanzemonde against Major Swan, a third at King and Queen against Captain Walker.

Article 11. As to the eleventh Article, wherein he is charged with very arbitrary and illegal proceedings with relation to His Majesty's attorneys, the Ordinary Attorney who refused his commands as illegal was Mr. Benjamin Harrison; the attorney that undertook them was Mr. Samuel Selden; the attorney whom the Governor took by the collar was Mr. Bartholomew Fowler.

Article 12. As to the twelfth Article, wherein he is charged as having committed men to custody in his rage, without any complaint or complainant, the instances of this are,

Captain George Marable, whom he committed to the custody of the Sheriff of James City and made him give five hundred pounds bail to answer it at the next General Court, because he refused to part with his lease.

And Mr. Mathews, and Mr. Mackie, whom he imprisoned among pirates in the common jail because they had been on board Captain Bayliff's ship of Bristol, who sailed for England before the rest of the ships, who carried the Governor's account of the taking [of] a pirate in that country.

Article 13. As to the thirteenth Article, wherein he is charged with the intercepting and breaking open and detaining of private letters, the instances I have known are,

A letter of Major Lewis Burwell's to Colonel Phillip Ludwell, Sr., which the Governor sent back to Major Burwell after he had detained it, to the best of my remembrance, about a year. And I heard both the Governor and Major Burwell speak of the intercepting of this letter. A letter of Captain James Moody to Mr. Mungo Ingles, which the Governor produced and had read in Council before Mr. Ingles, Mr. Ingles denying that ever he had communicated it to any person.

Several letters out of England for Colonel Harrison, Colonel Ludwell, Jr., and myself by the ship *Virginian*, Captain Barklet, Master, which the said Captain



sent to the Governor. After they had come through his hands we perceived them to have been broken open and sealed again, so that upon the second opening two folds of the paper under the seal were torn. Another time, the Governor having received great packets of letters for several persons by a ship arrived from England, he sent for me to receive my letters, and after he had given me two letters which he said were all that were for me I afterwards, looking over a parcel of gazettes and newspapers which lay on a chair in the room far from all the rest of the letters, found another letter for myself, superscribed by my Lord Bishop of London, covered with these gazettes and newspapers. Since I came from England my wife writes me word that Mr. Smith, a Minister who brought me in two letters whereof one was from My Lord Bishop of London, being commanded by the Governor to give them to him, the Governor took them and detained them and sent her a message by the Clerk of the Council that he had them and would keep them and would likewise intercept all letters that should come directed for me Commissary of Virginia. I am well assured likewise by letters from gentlemen of the Council in Virginia that after he had intercepted some of my Lord Bishop of London's letters to me he carried them to the Council and read there what parts of them he thought fit.

Article 14. As to the fourteenth Article, wherein he is charged with refusing to sign probates and administrations for many months, I do plainly remember the thing, it being in the year 1700, and that I used several arguments with him to persuade him to sign them as formerly, there being a great noise of debts that were lost for want of them. And accordingly, after he had forborne for about eight or nine months from the time of his rash oath in Court (and how long before I can't tell), he condescended to sign them again as before. But I do not remember the particular debts that were lost upon that occasion.

Article 15. As to the fifteenth Article, wherein he is charged with assuming a power of dispensing with the law in cases of the greatest consequence, besides the instance of Mr. Snead's marrying and ruining an orphan by his license, and the restraints and limitations laid upon Captain Thomas Swan and Mr. John Bowling, surveyors, by which a great many people were hindered from taking up the land to which they had a right by law, all [of] which are referred to in the margin of this Article. I find one instance more mentioned in the Council Book, No. 3, May 13, 1702, vizt. of a pardon he gave to one *Anne Tandy*, who had been condemned for the murder of a bastard child, whereas by his commission he has no power to pardon treason or willful murder.

Article 16. As to the sixteenth Article, wherein he is charged as having given good ground of suspicion of his carrying on dangerous designs for himself, the affidavits here referred to are so particular that there is no occasion for further instances, only I can't but observe to your Lordships that all along the Council and Assembly Minutes he makes such ado with the appearance of every strange Indian and so improves and magnifies all stories that are written to him con-

cerning the French and Indians, and makes so much noise with his continual numbering of the men, and modeling of the Militia and having lists returned of the arms, as if the country were under continual consternation and dread of an invasion from the enemy, on purpose to promote his beloved military forces, whereas the people of the country are under no such apprehensions, lying much out of the way of all enemies by land and their poverty securing them [so] that it will turn to no account for any enemy to attack them by sea, except they could transport so many people as to conquer and keep possession of the country itself, of which they think there is very little probability.

JAMES BLAIR

June 7, 1704  
Jo Edisbury

A POSTSCRIPT ON THOMAS JEFFERSON AND HIS  
UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

EDITED BY RICHARD BEALE DAVIS

Thomas Jefferson's ideas as to the proper qualifications for the university professor and his method of procuring the first faculty for his infant institution are among the more interesting and significant phases of his educational work. William P. Trent,<sup>1</sup> Herbert B. Adams,<sup>2</sup> and Philip A. Bruce<sup>3</sup> touched on these matters in their accounts of the founding of the University of Virginia. In *Francis Walker Gilmer: Life and Learning in Jefferson's Virginia*<sup>4</sup> the present writer told the story from the point of view of Jefferson's agent, Gilmer, who was sent to Europe to recruit the first faculty.

In February, 1946, following the discovery of a whole set of letters from Gilmer to Jefferson which had been long lost and not before printed, the present writer published *Correspondence of Thomas Jefferson and Francis Walker Gilmer, 1814-1826*,<sup>5</sup> a volume which gave first

<sup>1</sup> William P. Trent, *English Culture in Virginia*, in the *Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science*, Ser. VII, No. 5-6 (Baltimore, 1889).

<sup>2</sup> Herbert B. Adams, *Thomas Jefferson and the University of Virginia* (Washington, 1888).

<sup>3</sup> Philip A. Bruce, *History of the University of Virginia, 1819-1919*, 5 vols. (New York, 1920-1922).

<sup>4</sup> Richmond, 1939.

<sup>5</sup> Columbia, South Carolina, 1946. Of the seventy-one letters in this volume, fifty-one are from Gilmer and twenty from Jefferson.

hand, as no previous work had been able to do, the story of the labors of both Jefferson and Gilmer in founding the University.

The publication of this correspondence has fortunately resulted in the discovery of five additional Jefferson items dealing with the same subjects. They do not at all alter the picture already drawn, but they do fill in certain interesting and significant details. All five items<sup>6</sup> are in Jefferson's own hand. Four are rough drafts containing insertions, obliterations, and markings through. Of the four, three are early versions of letters known to have been sent to Gilmer,<sup>7</sup> and, so far as can be determined from Gilmer's replies, they were substantially the same as the drafts which he received.<sup>8</sup> The fourth informal draft is simply a page of Jefferson's jotted notations. A fifth item is a smooth draft of a letter of December 4, 1824.

The five together, curiously, cover quite well the period<sup>9</sup> of Jefferson's search in England for competent professors for the University of Virginia. Francis Walker Gilmer was invited to become, as the first letter (November 25, 1823) shows, both the University's agent in a mission to secure a faculty and its first professor of law.<sup>10</sup> Jefferson's instructions (April 26, 1824), just before Gilmer sailed, are summarized in the notes which comprise the second item. Between items two and three, Gilmer had most successfully accomplished his mission but had returned to the United States in desperately poor health. Item three (December 4, 1824) is primarily a discussion of accommodations for the five young professors secured in Great Britain. Item four (January 20, 1825), a most interesting letter, affords information as to what qualifications Jefferson expected in a professor of law, shows

<sup>6</sup> Now in the Library of Congress. Attention was called to them by Mr. L. H. Butterfield, assistant editor of the Princeton University *Papers of Thomas Jefferson*. Mr. Butterfield also courteously supplied copies of the letters and suggested that they be published.

<sup>7</sup> But evidently no longer extant. The date of the first is given in Gilmer's reply to it (December 3, 1823) as November 23, 1823, instead of November 25, 1823, as shown on the draft printed below.

<sup>8</sup> It is entirely possible that these drafts were somewhat altered in their final forms, for there are in other Jefferson letters variations between draft and final form.

<sup>9</sup> It does not cover, of course, the earlier period before the University was ready to open, when several Americans, including George Ticknor and Nathaniel Bowditch, as well as the Englishman Dr. Thomas Cooper, were approached or actually engaged.

<sup>10</sup> See Davis, *Francis Walker Gilmer*, 193-237.

disappointment at Gilmer's rejection of the chair, and adds further details of the internal affairs of the institution. The fifth and last letter (March 6, 1825) quite appropriately expresses the gratification of Jefferson and the other members of the Board of Visitors at Gilmer's mission well accomplished. And it, too, most characteristically includes considerable discussion of University affairs just a few weeks before the first session was formally begun.

A word as to text. Markings through have been indicated in footnote explanations. Partial or complete obliterations are annotated as clearly as possible. Insertions, usually made by Jefferson above the lines of which they are parts and indicated by carets, are here, for convenience, enclosed in half-brackets in the body of the text. Brackets are occasionally used to indicate doubtful readings.

Jefferson's letters always necessitate some commentary on his idiosyncrasies of spelling and punctuation. Such words as *receive* are usually spelled *recieve*; but *their* usually appears in the normal spelling, though even here he is not always consistent. Suffixes, such as *-ion*, are frequently condensed into a final *n*. Other peculiarities in spelling and capitalization, and in the use of the comma and period, will be immediately obvious to the reader.

---

Mont<sup>o</sup>. Nov. 25. [18]23.

Dear Sir

The belief is now become so general that the legislature will at the ensuing session dispose of the debt of the University so as to liberate it's funds and bring it into action, that I think it a duty to be taking such measures to save time as may be provisionally taken without injury if we should be disappointed.<sup>11</sup> the Visitors have from the beginning determined to employ no professors but of the first order of science in their respective lines; and altho' they would prefer natives in equal degree, yet they would not take one of second grade in preference to a foreigner of the first. the Professor of Law and Govrnt indeed must be a native; but for the others [or most of them] I fear we must go abroad; and identity of language will necessarily lead<sup>12</sup> us to Gr. Br. and Ireland. and to ensure the choice there of characters corresponding with our

<sup>11</sup> The first syllable of this word is at the end of a line, and *appointed* appears at the beginning of the next line above an undecipherable marked out portion of a word.

<sup>12</sup> *Confine* has been crossed out and *lead* substituted.

views we must send an agent of our own competent to the choice. our Visitors, from their dispersed & distant situations cannot be assembled for the special purpose of appointment and will not meet until after the legislature shall have acted on this subject: but, not to lose time we should then have an agent ready to propose to them on whose acceptance of the mission we can rely. on a consultation with mr Madison, the only one I have been able to see, we concur in our wishes that you could be engaged for this mission. but we are aware that you could not suspend your professional business<sup>13</sup> 6. or 8. months for this occasional office,<sup>14</sup> and therefore have extended our views to 'an additional' one of more permanence. of the persons within our state who might be willing and qualified to fill the chair of Law & govnt, we equally concur in our preference of yourself for that place;<sup>15</sup> and altho' we cannot presume to speak for our colleagues, yet we naturally suppose that the reasons which weigh with us will weigh with them also to give the same preference. for the agency to Gr. Britain we think a sum of 1500. D. should be allowed. as to the salaries to the Professors nothing has been fixed. if we engage 10. professors as proposed in the law, our annuity would afford but 1500. D. of yearly salary to each, with a house for their residence. if we should find it expedient to condense the sciences within the competence of '7. or' 8. Professors, we might perhaps advance towards <sup>16</sup> 2000. D. this must depend on our board. as to the tenure of the office, a Professor cannot be removed but by the vote of 2/3 of the whole number of visitors, and consequently 5. out of the 7 must concur. you know the characters and consequently can judge whether this would not be as much a tenure for life as that of a judge removable by a *majority* 'only' in a court of impeachment.<sup>17</sup> a lecture of one hour every other day 'or at most one every day' will probably be the time of necessary attendance. when I add to this the oppty of devoting the rest of your time to studies so much more congenial with your habits and inclinations, the learned society in which you will be placed, 'and the control and friendly relation in which you will stand to them as their first acquaintce & conductor here,' the neighborhood too of your relations & earliest friends, and the superior profit of the vocation, I cannot but

<sup>13</sup> Since January, 1818, when he moved from Winchester to Richmond, Gilmer had developed a promising and already lucrative law practice. See Davis, *Francis Walker Gilmer*, 149-51.

<sup>14</sup> *Service* has been crossed out and *office* substituted.

<sup>15</sup> Jefferson is most tactful here. His wording is careful, for Gilmer may have known then or might come to know later that Joseph C. Cabell had been previously asked to undertake the mission. See *Early History of the University of Virginia as Contained in the Letters of Thomas Jefferson and Joseph C. Cabell* (Richmond, 1856), 283-84. Cabell declined, or rather withdrew a previous acceptance, in a letter of October 27, 1823.

<sup>16</sup> Changed from *go to even to advance towards*.

<sup>17</sup> Of the Board of Visitors (Jefferson, Madison, Chapman Johnson, James Breckinridge, George Loyall, John H. Cocke, and Joseph C. Cabell) at least four (Jefferson, Madison, Johnson, and Cocke) were personal friends of Gilmer.

think you will prefer this position to the labors, contentions, and dependence of your present calling. I say *superior profit*, because yours will probably be one of the most numerous schools of the whole. no determination indeed has been finally taken as to the exact amount of the tuition fees, but it has been contemplated to allow from students attending 3. professors 20. D. to each Professor; from those attending 2. Professors 25. D. each, & from those attending one only 40. D. your students will rarely attend any other Professor as a course of Law-reading will require their undivided attention. what number might attend, cannot be foreseen but I presume we might count on not less than one annually from every county. if only half that number comes it will add 2000. D. to the salary and house.

This proposition going to a permanent change in the pursuits of your life, will require of course some time for consideration; altho with me at a like period [of life] it would not have required a moment.<sup>18</sup> yet take time to make up your mind, but as little as may suffice: because should you decline it, we should know it as soon as possible that we may be looking elsewhere. this matter is known to nobody but mr Madison and myself,<sup>19</sup> and now to you. you will percieve at once that there are many reasons why it should be kept inviolably a secret but to ourselves. should you determine to accept,<sup>20</sup> it would be important that, at the first moment of leisure your courts may admit, ———<sup>21</sup> you should give me the opportunity of a sufficient length of conversn to explain & mature our views of what is to be done.  
ever & affectionately yours

Th.J

[April 26, 1824]

Agenda<sup>22</sup>

Garrett. Excha. on London 8000. D.  
advance to 6. 1500.<sup>23</sup>

<sup>18</sup> The words *for decision* have been crossed out.

<sup>19</sup> In his reply to this letter Gilmer states that "the wish" that he accept such an appointment was "intimated to me, long ago, by three of your colleagues." Davis (ed.), *Correspondence of Jefferson and Gilmer*, 81. Evidently he had been discussed at some earlier meeting of the Visitors, but since Cabell had then been the candidate for at least the mission, the actual offer to Gilmer was known only to Madison and Jefferson.

<sup>20</sup> Jefferson wrote *accept it*, and then crossed out *it*.

<sup>21</sup> Two or three words were obliterated here by Jefferson.

<sup>22</sup> On the Library of Congress copy is typed "discussion with Gilmer of agenda (for meeting of U. of Virginia Board of Visitors)." It would seem to have been, however, only a series of notes, either for or as a result of personal discussion, for it bears the endorsement by Jefferson: "Gilmer Fr.W. Apr. 26. 24/ conversations."

<sup>23</sup> Bruce, *History of the University of Virginia*, I, 357, states that Gilmer was allowed \$1500 personal expenses, \$2000 for advances to professors, and \$6000 for scientific apparatus. The maximum salary Gilmer could guarantee was \$1500 and student fees. See also, Jefferson's letter of November 25, 1823, above.

Lackington<sup>24</sup>

letters from Ticknor?<sup>25</sup>

Russell.<sup>26</sup>

warn professors of term 10½ school hours-<sup>27</sup> furniture. books. religion.  
[politics]

- G. enquire into temper, sobriety<sup>28</sup>  
men with families acceptable<sup>29</sup>  
no clergyman.<sup>30</sup>

apparatus

text books.

Cambridge Math. Nat. phil. Nat. hist.<sup>31</sup>

Oxford. Antt. languages<sup>32</sup>

Edinbg Anatomy<sup>33</sup>

<sup>24</sup> A London bookseller from whom Gilmer evidently planned to make his purchases of books; but he found that the firm had changed hands, and that Bohn was much more reasonable in prices. Davis (ed.), *Correspondence of Jefferson and Gilmer*, 87, 121.

<sup>25</sup> George Ticknor, of Boston (1791-1871), scholar and friend of both Gilmer and Jefferson, had recently returned from European study. He had earlier been offered one of the University of Virginia professorships but declined. *Jefferson-Cabell Correspondence*, 460. There is no evidence that Gilmer did carry letters from Ticknor. It was probably considered unnecessary, as most of Ticknor's acquaintances had been formed on the continent, to which it was not contemplated that Gilmer should go.

<sup>26</sup> Perhaps letters were planned to Lord John Russell (1792-1878), British Whig statesman and acquaintance of Ticknor. See George S. Hillard, Mrs. Anna E. Ticknor, and Miss Anna E. Ticknor (eds.), *Life, Letters, and Journals of George Ticknor*, 2 vols. (Boston, 1876), I, 264, 269, 270. It is possible, however, that Jefferson was thinking of the Rev. Michael Russell's *A View of the System of Education at Present Pursued in the Universities of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1813), which he had not been able to find in America. In October he wrote Gilmer to try to procure a copy in England. Davis (ed.), *Correspondence of Jefferson and Gilmer*, 109.

<sup>27</sup> The original length of the term was ten and one-half months, the holiday being from December 15 to the last of January. For a discussion of school hours, housing, and related matters, see Bruce, *History of the University of Virginia*, II, 59-134.

<sup>28</sup> So successful was Gilmer that only one of his choices (and that only partially his), George Blaetterman, appears to have been of unusual or eccentric temper. After many years as a successful teacher, this professor had to be dismissed for cruelty to his wife.

<sup>29</sup> Gilmer to Jefferson, November 30, 1824, in Davis (ed.), *Correspondence of Jefferson and Gilmer*, 121. One professor secured by Gilmer had a wife and child, two others, wives, and two were unmarried.

<sup>30</sup> Gilmer faithfully observed this direction. See Gilmer to Jefferson, September 15, 1824, *ibid.*, 102.

<sup>31</sup> The professor of mathematics, Thomas H. Key, was a graduate of Trinity College, Cambridge.

<sup>32</sup> Actually George Long, first professor of ancient languages, was a fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Gilmer did look at Oxford for professors.

<sup>33</sup> Dr. Robley Duglison, first professor of anatomy, had attended Edinburgh University, but held M.D. degrees from other institutions.

London. Mod. lang Blaetterman. A-S books.<sup>84</sup> Make out list  
 Woolwich. Ivory.<sup>85</sup> the 3 bodies. Laplace. test.  
 drawing. music. dancing.<sup>86</sup>

letter to Rush

Dugald Stewart

Parr

Blaetterman.<sup>87</sup>

the very name of Oxford or Cambridge gives reputn

2. persons to consult better than one. one guard against the other.

men with families preferred

furniture

take up his abode at Cambridge

write every fortnight.

let his lrs precede his visit<sup>88</sup>

Monticello Dec. 4. 24.

Dear Sir

I recieved yesterday your favor of the 20.<sup>th</sup> ult. and I this day write to mr Anderson, Comptroller, for instructions to the Collector to exempt the books of

<sup>84</sup> Blaetterman, first professor of modern languages, was a German living in London. Gilmer wrote later that he had secured all the Anglo-Saxon books listed in Jefferson's catalogue, and one or two more. Gilmer to Jefferson, November 30, 1824, in Davis (ed.), *Correspondence of Jefferson and Gilmer*, 121.

<sup>85</sup> Gilmer mentioned James Ivory (1765-1842), professor of mathematics at the Royal Academy at Marlow, in two letters (Davis [ed.], *Correspondence of Jefferson and Gilmer*, 87, 99) with some idea of engaging him, but there is no indication that he actually interviewed the man. Evidently he wanted an English text instead of a French one of Laplace. The meaning of "the 3 bodies" and "test" remains obscure, although Mr. Francis L. Berkeley, Jr., curator of manuscripts in the Alderman Library of the University of Virginia, offers a clue to "the 3 bodies." He reports that of Laplace's books from the original University Library, "two are divided into consideration of three phenomena: celestial mechanics, capillation, and tidal effects. Like Jefferson's own letters on astronomy, they are concerned largely with the three most obvious celestial bodies." Through the Royal Academy at Woolwich and its professor of mathematics, Peter Barlow, Gilmer selected Charles Bonnycastle as professor of natural philosophy.

<sup>86</sup> From the beginning Jefferson reserved a room in the Rotunda for instruction in the fine arts, but there is no evidence that Gilmer was asked to look for an instructor in these fields. See Bruce, *History of the University of Virginia*, II, 126-27.

<sup>87</sup> Gilmer's letters of introduction included those to Richard Rush (1780-1859), American minister to England; Dugald Stewart (1753-1828), Scottish philosopher; Dr. Samuel Parr (1747-1825), English classicist and educator; and Dr. George Blaetterman, later first professor of modern languages in the University of Virginia.

<sup>88</sup> Evidently Gilmer usually followed this procedure, though occasionally circumstances determined otherwise, as in the case of his first visit to Dr. Parr. See Davis (ed.), *Correspondence of Jefferson and Gilmer*, 86.



the Professors from Duty;<sup>39</sup> and I inclose to mr Thompson the Collector of New York the Comptroller's letter to me promising to give him such instructions. this will prevent embarrasment should they arrive before the instructions get to hand.

The gentlemen will be at some loss on their arrival at the University for immediate accommodations; for it would be as disagreeable as expensive to be in a tavern beyond a day or two. I am endeavoring to get one of the house-keepers who has rented an Hotel to get into it immediately and be in readiness to diet them,<sup>40</sup> until they can make their own preparations[.] the Pavilions are in readiness to recieve them;<sup>41</sup> but you know that they are unfurnished, and that they cannot in the instant provide themselves in a place of so little resource as Charlottesville, even with what they cannot do a day without, to wit, a bed, table, some chairs Etc. I will desire the Proctor to look out and see how they may be provided with such things without which they cannot avail themselves even of a room in their Pavilions to lodge in.

I begin to hope from your last letter that you may be able to come on with, if not before them. very sincerely wishing this, I salute you affectionately.

TH. JEFFERSON.

---

Mont.<sup>o</sup> Jan. 20. 25.

Dear Sir

Your ltr of the 13<sup>th</sup>. was read on the 17<sup>th</sup>. and I can only express my [sincere] regrets that you do not permit us<sup>42</sup> to consider you as accepting our Law professorship.<sup>43</sup> no one knows better than yourself the difficulty we shall have in getting a competent substitute. I abhor the idea of a mere Gothic lawyer, who knows nothing out of Co. Lit.<sup>44</sup> who would not be able to associate with his colleagues in conversn, or [to utter] to enquiring strangers a single academ-

<sup>39</sup> Jefferson's letter of November 21, 1824, to Gilmer on this subject, *ibid.*, 116. This present letter is simply one of confirmation of a previous promise.

<sup>40</sup> Certain buildings along the "Ranges" were designed to be boarding houses, or "hotels," and were rented to private persons who were to charge the students directly for meals, but also to have semi-official duties in the University. Bruce, *History of the University of Virginia*, II, 216-29.

<sup>41</sup> The ten elaborate professorial residences spaced at intervals between student dormitories along East and West Lawn. Each included on the main floor one large room for class meetings.

<sup>42</sup> Jefferson has crossed out *we are not* and substituted *you do not permit us*.

<sup>43</sup> Gilmer's declination of the professorship appears to have been motivated by his ambition to succeed in active legal practice, perhaps with the idea of entering politics. Later he did accept, probably because he despaired of regaining his health sufficiently for active practice.

<sup>44</sup> That is, *Coke-upon-Littleton*, the first part of Sir Edward Coke's *Institutes* on the common law. The word *who*, which follows, has been substituted for *and*.

ical idea. Kent, even if he would accept, is out of the question with me.<sup>45</sup> the Federal principle now is consolidn and a prostration of the barrier of the states. an angel from heaven who should inculcate such principles [in our school of govmt] should be rejected by me.

Our books &c (8. boxes) are arrived. I have had the covers taken off to admit dry air, but we cannot take them out for want of the catalogue; because if we do not assort them under their proper heads of arrangemt when [first] broken out, it would be infinitely difficult afterwds. will you be so good as to send me the catalogue [by return of mail] for I think they are suffering from damp.<sup>46</sup>

I was applied to some time ago on behalf of Dr. Emmett<sup>47</sup> as professor of chemistry, and believing then that that deptmt was assured to Dunglison,<sup>48</sup> I answered that it was engaged. being otherwise informed by a subsequent ltr from you, I concur with you in opin that we cannot do better than to accept Emmett. I think mr Madison is of the same opin and it might not perhaps [be] amiss if you were to drop him line to prevent his engaging otherwise. you might even venture to name myself at least as in his favor<sup>49</sup> and perhaps could yourself ascertain the opn of the Visitors in Richm<sup>d</sup>. and convey to him their [probable] concurrence.<sup>50</sup> we shall have a meeting of the [board] on the rising of the legislr at farthest, and he should be ready to come on immediately.

I hope your health and strength will permit you soon to visit us. to the settlemt of the acc<sup>t</sup>. of the Professors down to the 31<sup>st</sup>. of Dec. your assistance will be indispensable. on the subject of mr Campbell's ltr [too] I wish to

<sup>45</sup> Chancellor James Kent of New York (1763-1847), jurist and legal commentator. In his letter of January 13, 1825, Gilmer had mentioned him as a possible candidate for the law professorship. Davis (ed.), *Correspondence of Jefferson and Gilmer*, 128. It is interesting to note that Bruce, *History of the University of Virginia*, II, 27, wonders what Jefferson's reaction to Kent would have been, which, of course, is good evidence that the present letter was not available. For elaboration of Jefferson's ideas as to the proper qualifications for the law professorship, see his letters to Joseph C. Cabell of February 23, 1824, and May 13, 1825, in *Jefferson-Cabell Correspondence*, 291-92, 351-52.

<sup>46</sup> At this point Jefferson started a new paragraph, as follows: "I hope your health and strength will soon permit you to"; but this was crossed out and the next sentence written without paragraph indentation.

<sup>47</sup> John Patton Emmet (1797-1842) had been interviewed by Gilmer in New York. Gilmer had recommended Emmet in a letter of December 3, 1824. Davis (ed.), *Correspondence of Jefferson and Gilmer*, 123.

<sup>48</sup> Dr. Robley Dunglison (1798-1869), medical writer and teacher, was first professor of anatomy. Gilmer to Jefferson, September 15, 1824, November 12, 1824, and December 3, 1824, *ibid.*, 102, 113, 124.

<sup>49</sup> The word *and* has been crossed out at the beginning of this sentence. At this point, Jefferson has crossed out *us as concurring* and substituted *myself at least as in his favor*. Later in the same sentence, he has substituted *ascertain the opn of for speak to*.

<sup>50</sup> Chapman Johnson was an active Richmond lawyer. Joseph C. Cabell and George Loyall were members of the legislature then in session in the city.

consult you,<sup>51</sup> and some other matters. Long<sup>52</sup> and Blaetterman are establ<sup>d</sup>. in their Pavilions, and seem satisf<sup>d</sup> in everything except the having nothing to do. 3 of the occupants of our hotels are arrived and ready to recieve their boarders, and the other 3 daily expected. the moment I hear of the arrival of the 3. Professors<sup>54</sup> I shall announce the opening of the instrion on that day fortnight ever & affect<sup>ly</sup>. yours

Th. J.

Monticello Mar. 6. 25.

Dear Sir

The board of Visitors met the day before yesterday and I laid laid before them your letters, your report and documents<sup>55</sup> and I have the pleasure to assure you that the manner in which you have executed your mission has given them the most perfect and unqualified satisfaction. [and they are especially pleased with your selection of Professors as far as they see of them as yet.] I now return you the particular document that (of mr Leslie)<sup>56</sup> which you meant to be confidential, and wished to have returned. we consider the books as well selected & well bought the apparatus is not yet opened.

On the meeting of the board mr Bonnycastle<sup>57</sup> sent us a letter stating that at the time of his being recommended as Professor of Nat. Phil. in this univ<sup>ty</sup>.

<sup>51</sup> In a letter of November 13, 1824, Gilmer mentions this letter from Thomas Campbell, the poet, saying "all Campbell expects is, the patronage of the university and yourself for his young friend, whom he represents as a first rate scholar, & he is a most competent judge." Davis (ed.), *Correspondence of Jefferson and Gilmer*, 114. The person discussed may be either one of the professors already engaged, or more probably some prospective one.

<sup>52</sup> George Long, first professor of classical languages, had arrived somewhat earlier than the other Englishmen.

<sup>53</sup> The "f" here appears in an elongated and curled form, perhaps as another of Jefferson's condensations representing suffix incorporated in the stem of the word.

<sup>54</sup> Key, Bonnycastle, and Dungleison, who had sailed together, did not land at Norfolk until early February, 1825. Gilmer to Jefferson, February 14, 1825, in Davis (ed.), *Correspondence of Jefferson and Gilmer*, 136. Much anxiety had been felt because of this delay.

<sup>55</sup> See *ibid.*, 131-33, for Gilmer's report and list of documents.

<sup>56</sup> Parentheses are Jefferson's. This appears to be item (K) in the list of documents, a letter from Sir John Leslie (1766-1832), mathematician and natural philosopher, who offered to assist the infant university by lecturing during its first two months. Though Leslie had considerable reputation, Jefferson wisely declined the offer on the ground that this departure after only a short stay would do more harm, especially to the reputation of the institution, than good. Davis (ed.), *Correspondence of Jefferson and Gilmer*, 96, 108.

<sup>57</sup> Charles Bonnycastle's claim was discussed fully from Gilmer's point of view in a letter of March 12, 1825. See *ibid.*, 138-40. The matter seems to have been worked out eventually quite satisfactorily for all parties.

he was not in England, and his friend mr Barlow,<sup>58</sup> who managed the transaction, stated to you that the only difficulty lay in a bond of £500. in which he was bound to the British govm't. that you undertook to pay this bond; but that his return being delayed much beyond the time which<sup>59</sup> was expected, you had, in the interval, exhausted your funds, and could therefore only promise that every exertion should be used, on your part, to induce the Rector & Visitors to discharge the bond in question, and that you apprehended no difficulty whatever upon the subject.

As this made no part of the 'written' agreemt signed by him & yourself, and now in our possession 'nor has been mentioned in any of your communics to me' the board requested me to ask from you a statement of what passed on this subject, and your view of the understanding which took place on this occasion, and being desirous to do whatever,<sup>60</sup> the interest and credit of the university would justify and require, if the circumstances of the case so appear they will have the advance made from the funds of the Institution. as I cannot give a final answer to mr Bonnycastle until I recieve this 'informn' from you I will ask your answer as soon as conveniently practicable.

Mr. George Tucker, late of Congress is appointed Professor of Moral Philosophy,<sup>61</sup> and Dr. John Patton Emmet<sup>62</sup> of N. York Professor of Chemistry &c. the chair of Law is not yet definitively filled.<sup>63</sup> the weather has for 6. or 7. days past been so rainy as to obstruct very much the arrival of the Students 'several however are in place' many are expected in the course of today and tomorrow, and 'in the course of the week the different schools will be organized and opened.' accept the assurance of my affectionate esteem and respect

Th. J.

<sup>58</sup> Peter Barlow (1776-1827), professor at the Royal Academy at Woolwich, had assisted Gilmer in selecting professors. Davis, *Francis Walker Gilmer*, 224, and Jefferson-Gilmer "notes" of April 26, 1824, above.

<sup>59</sup> Jefferson first wrote *that* and then changed the word to *which*.

<sup>60</sup> The words *from the circumstances of the case* have been crossed out at this point.

<sup>61</sup> Already fifty years of age, Tucker became the first chairman of the faculty.

<sup>62</sup> See footnote 47, above.

<sup>63</sup> Henry St. George Tucker, Philip P. Barbour, Dabney Carr, and W. A. C. Dade declined the chair in turn. It was offered to Gilmer again and he accepted, but did not live to serve. Bruce, *History of the University of Virginia*, II, 27-32. William Wirt, attorney general of the United States, declined the proffered professorship combined with the presidency. Finally John Tayloe Lomax was elected. He accepted and served for several years.

## Book Reviews

*The British Empire before the American Revolution. Volume VI. The Great War for the Empire; The Years of Defeat, 1754-1757.* By Lawrence Henry Gipson. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1946. Pp. xxxvii, 426, xxxviii. Maps and plans. \$7.50.)

In many respects this is the most significant volume in Professor Gipson's monumental series which is doing so much to revise the traditional interpretation of American colonial history. It maintains the very high standard which we have come to expect from its author as to factual accuracy, soundness of interpretation, and literary quality. Although much of the book deals with military and naval history, there is a good over-all account of this dramatic period "when the fate of a continent was at stake," and one gets a clear picture of the important personalities, political intrigues, and various developments which were so important during "the years of defeat, 1754-1757." The outcome of this war was to determine "to our own day the main trends of historical development not only in North America but in the subcontinent of India," the author asserts; its consequences were "even more momentous" than those of the American Revolution and the Civil War.

Professor Gipson explodes many generally accepted myths which have become a part of the "American National Tradition." He maintains that no "responsible American" during the years 1750-1760 would have upheld the thesis of Tom Paine that the connection of the colonies with Great Britain had been "not a blessing but a curse." He insists that France, not England, was responsible for the French and Indian war, and that in the beginning the conflict had nothing to do with the old animosities of Europe. He says that the war "was really begun by the French and directed against American colonial trade and territorial expansion." He shows that France was determined "to bind the English colonies to the east of the mountains," and that it is absurd to suppose that in 1754 American colonials were adequately equipped to care for themselves without British aid. Further, he explodes the idea that colonial Indian fighting methods were far superior to those of British regulars and that England blundered in not giving Americans more responsibility in the conduct of the war.

The English colonies in North America were in a perilous position in the years 1754-1757. It is true that they had superior man power, but they were lacking in military training and military supplies and they were opposed by dangerous Indians on the frontier and by "some of the finest and best led regi-

ments in the world," sent to Canada by France. And to make matters worse there was pitifully little co-ordination between colonial governments, the classic examples being the attitude of Dinwiddie of Virginia toward Governor Glen of South Carolina and the feud between William Shirley and Sir William Johnson. Braddock, traditional scapegoat of the war, is portrayed as a very competent field commander who was "woefully misled and finally trapped to his death by unbelievable stupidity that must be laid primarily at the door of Dinwiddie."

The author attributes the British defeat at Fort Duquesne to Gage's errors in judgment and clearly shows that the General had been "lulled into a sense of false security." Two excellent chapters are devoted to the expulsion, wanderings, and hardships of the Acadians. The author claims that it was absolutely necessary that they be removed to make Nova Scotia safe for the British, and declares that the "chief blame for their misfortunes cannot justly be placed upon either the government of Great Britain or that of Nova Scotia."

The last chapters deal with the British "continental system" and an explanation of its failure, the "new friends" of England and the so-called reversal of alliances, the loss of Minorca to France, and, lastly, the beginning of a "world war" with the outbreak of hostilities in Europe in 1756. Except for the story of Admiral Byng's execution there is little in the book beyond the year 1756.

The volume contains twenty-six contemporary maps and plans, some of which are reproduced for the first time. Very few typographical errors have been noted. The index is excellent and copious.

University of North Carolina

HUGH T. LEFLER

*Scientific Thought in the American Colleges, 1638-1800.* By Theodore Hornberger. (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1946. Pp. vi, 108. Illustrations, bibliography. \$1.50 in cloth binding, \$1.00 in paper cover.)

This small volume on scientific thought in American colleges in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, written by a professor of English in the University of Texas and published by the University as one of the projects of its Research Institute, fails to fulfill the promise of its sponsorship. A book review is not the proper place in which to discuss the appropriateness of a professor of literature's devoting himself to a study of scientific thought in American colleges. Nor is it necessary to lament the fact that competent scholars in the fields of American history and education have left this fascinating subject open for exploitation by a professor of English.

In an essay of eighty-eight pages, Mr. Hornberger discusses the following topics: values in the history of science; the first American colleges; entrance requirements; the college curriculum; teachers, methods, and textbooks; libraries; and the effects of college instruction in science on contemporary American thought. This essay is followed by fourteen and a half pages of notes, com-

prising a critical bibliography of the more accessible sources. There is also a four-page index, voluminous but not invariably accurate.

Mr. Hornberger's essay is an excellent example of current American scholarship. It is noble in intention, well documented, and based on a careful study of the materials in the Huntington Library, and those at Cambridge, Ann Arbor, and Austin. His premise appears to be that the materials of American history are to be found in the great libraries. The few gleanings that might have been obtained by personal visits to such out of the way places as Hampden-Sydney, Virginia, or Greeneville, Tennessee, hardly seemed to him significant. In his selection of colleges to be investigated, he relied heavily, if not exclusively, on Samuel Miller's *A Brief Retrospect of the Eighteenth Century*, published in 1803. The Reverend Mr. Miller was a New Yorker, and compiled his twelve-page college directory largely by correspondence. If Professor Hornberger had supplemented Miller by a study of catalogues and records in some of the smaller colleges, his very valuable work would have been enriched in some of its most barren spots. Moreover, certain apparent errors in fact or interpretation might have been avoided. For example, he states on page 14 that Transylvania "became after many vicissitudes the University of Kentucky." The last time this reviewer was in Lexington, the University of Kentucky and Transylvania College were on opposite sides of town, and in the library of Transylvania there were many mementoes of its former scientific prestige. The College of Charleston, founded in 1770, and with a professor of chemistry on its faculty by 1793, is dismissed with the statement that its reputation "was still to be made." So was that of the United States.

More remarkable in a professor of English than the not infrequent lacunae in his historical knowledge is his complete indifference to the mutations of the word "science" in the last hundred and fifty years. The word as popularly used today almost invariably refers to the natural sciences. And that is the meaning which Mr. Hornberger attaches to it, oblivious of the fact that up until rather recently the word was frequently, and correctly, used to indicate knowledge and wisdom in general. All seven of the liberal arts were formerly comprised by the word "science." The author's mysterious failure to distinguish between the two meanings of the word vitiates his conclusions on the effects of scientific instruction on contemporary American thought. He is amazed, for example, to find a Federalist youth in 1798 eulogizing science, religion, and liberty in the same breath. His amazement is unwarranted, however, since the speaker merely meant learning or knowledge.

The University of Texas states in a publisher's blurb that this essay "is a by-product of fifteen years of study of American literature and history of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries." Even by-products deserve better treatment than this one has received from both its author and its publisher.

*A Description of Kentucky in North America: To Which Are Prefixed Miscellaneous Observations Respecting the United States.* [By Harry Toulmin]. Edited by Thomas D. Clark. *Kentucky Reprints*, No. 3. (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1945. Pp. xiv, 120. Map.)

This is a reprint of a volume by Harry Toulmin, published in 1793. The purpose of the original publication, as given in its prefacing advertisement, was "to furnish in a small compass, and at a trifling expense, such information, as would be most useful to those who have any thoughts of removing to America." The furnisher himself was a recent immigrant from England, and had barely esconced himself in Lexington when he gave his "information" to the world. It was not a book based on personal observation but a compilation of extracts from books which Toulmin had consulted, perhaps when he had been meditating immigration. The sobriety and moderation of the extracts chosen to make up *A Description* show that the real purpose of the book was precisely what it pretended to be. Had Toulmin been a land speculator or a member of the Kentucky Booster Society (of which the reviewer has always been a devout member) he certainly would have selected passages more lurid than these with which to picture God's Country and the Garden Spot of the World.

It evidently was Toulmin's belief that the felicity of an immigrant in his new home depended neither on a knowledge of its history nor in an acquaintance with its government. The history he prepared is distinguished for its brevity and inaccuracy, while the government described is not the government of Kentucky, but of Virginia. But in the evident conviction that the pursuit of happiness would be most vigorously sustained by those who were able to keep body and soul together, Toulmin chose his economic extracts with painstaking care. He accurately described the Kentucky rivers on which the settler would have to rely for a measure of his transportation. He told him in what localities the infertile soils were to be found; he described the productions of Kentucky with misleading emphasis on the making of salt and maple sugar; he went into detail about prices and wages. He did not discuss politics, but, under the heading of climate, he remarked that "when you arrive in Kentucky you experience a greater temperature of air than in any country I have ever travelled in." Kentucky (like other Paradises) was somewhat inaccessible, and Toulmin advised the immigrant to come by way of Alexandria, Cumberland, and the Ohio River. He passed on the assurance from Imlay that "there are no musketoes in Kentucky," but the reviewer finds it difficult to believe that those now in residence could have attained their present technique in the short period since 1793.

*A Description of Kentucky* is the third in a series of Kentucky Reprints being issued by the University of Kentucky, and is a worthy successor of Littell's *Festoons of Fancy* and Magill's *Kentucky Emigrant*. The original volume has become so rare that its antiquarian value has come to exceed the historical. But it has great historical value because of the composite picture it gives of condi-



tions in Kentucky at that time, and the reprinting will rescue it from the bibliophile and give it back to the student of history. The reprinting of it, therefore, has been as well worth doing as it has been a work well done.

Florida State College for Women

ROBERT S. COTTERILL

*Correspondence of Thomas Jefferson and Francis Walker Gilmer, 1814-1826.*

Edited by Richard Beale Davis. (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1946. Pp. 163. Illustrations, bibliography. \$2.50.)

This volume brings together conveniently all the known letters between the Sage of Monticello and the man almost fifty years his junior to whom Jefferson referred as "the best educated subject we have raised since the Revolution." Most of the originals of the seventy-one letters printed here are available in two libraries: those by Jefferson in the University of Virginia, those by Gilmer in the Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis. Since the editor, Dr. Richard Beale Davis, did not know that the latter were extant when he published in 1939 his *Francis Walker Gilmer: Life and Learning in Jefferson's Virginia*, his discovery of them moved him to prepare the entire correspondence for publication. When they were in the possession of the Gilmer family in the nineteenth century, Professor William P. Trent had access to both groups of letters, a few of which he printed in his *English Culture in Virginia* (1889). Some of these were reprinted in Davis' biography. Comparison of the texts as previously published with those in the present book indicates that Trent took certain liberties in copying the manuscripts which Davis has now rendered accurately.

The editor has classified the letters under three headings without altering the chronological sequence of the whole: (1) intellectual interests, professional problems and friendships, November, 1814-November, 1823, when Gilmer was practising law in Winchester and Richmond; (2) Gilmer's mission to England, December, 1823-November, 1824, to secure professors, books, and scientific apparatus for the University of Virginia; (3) problems of the University, Gilmer's professorship and search for health, November, 1824-January, 1826 (Gilmer died on February 25, less than six months before Jefferson). Throughout the correspondence runs the feeling, expressed or implied, of intellectual affinity and deep friendship of the two men. "Jefferson was tender and even affectionate," writes Professor Davis in his introduction; "Gilmer's affection is half-hidden in respectful dignity to the end. They understood each other." Most of the subject matter Professor Davis had covered adequately in his biography of Gilmer, without benefit of the manuscripts in the Missouri Historical Society. Here is a good illustration of the point that the historian may not need to examine all the sources in order to write authentic history. This comment is not intended, however, to minimize the service performed by the editor in providing the text of the entire correspondence.

In his twelve-page introduction Professor Davis has given sufficient background for the reader's understanding of the sequence of events and the problems with which Jefferson and Gilmer were confronted. The editor has used proper restraint in reproducing the text without following slavishly the idiosyncrasies of the calligraphy of that period, and his index is satisfactory. But the University of South Carolina Press has not added a cubit to its stature by leaving the manufacture of the book to the mercy of a job printer.

Institute of Early American  
History and Culture

LESTER J. CAPPON

*Florida Becomes a State.* Edited by Dorothy Dodd. (Tallahassee: Florida Centennial Commission, 1945. Pp. xiii, 481. Illustrations, notes, map. \$3.50.)

This is perhaps the most valuable of the several Florida centennial volumes which have been published during the last two years. The plan to have this work appear during the celebration of Florida's centennial, in 1945, was formulated by Governor Spessard L. Holland and the Florida State Library Board. The purpose of the work is to stimulate interest among Floridians in their state and its history.

The book consists of fifty-seven selected documents, relating especially to the admission of Florida into the Union. The documents, which reveal the many problems and controversies in Florida history from 1821 through 1845, were selected from various sources, including United States government publications, state publications, manuscripts, and newspapers. Most of the collection is located in the Florida State Library. The documents consist of extracts from messages and proclamations of the various governors, petitions and memorials to Congress from the people asking for statehood, petitions to Congress asking for the division of the territory into two parts, reports of the territorial House and Senate of Florida, the journal of the proceedings of the Constitutional Convention, the first constitution of the state, the bill for the admission of Florida into the Union, and various other documents which relate to the period.

Probably more of the documents deal with the controversy over the division of the territory and its subsequent admission into the Union than with any other one subject. The territory was split over this issue for many years, and from time to time petitions were forwarded to Congress by groups of individuals and the legislative council urging action in one way or another. Among the several petitions included in the book, perhaps the most interesting was drawn up on February 5, 1838, by Andrew Andrews and a group of 289 East Floridians. It emphatically told Congress that "Nature never intended that East Florida should be formed into a State with Middle and West Florida. Its geographical position presents an insuperable objection. It is only necessary to cast the eye over the Map, to see that at no distant day a separation must from

necessity take place" (p. 125). Other similar petitions were sent to Congress, and this lack of unity on the part of the people of Florida kept Congress uncertain as to the action it should take concerning statehood.

Perhaps the most important, certainly the most lengthy, document in the volume, is the Journal of the Proceedings of the Constitutional Convention, held at St. Joseph on December 3, 1838. The convention met every day except Sunday until January 11, 1839. Among the conflicts on the convention floor, that between the bank party and the anti-bank party was the most bitter. This controversy was running its course in national politics, as well as claiming much local attention throughout Florida. The new constitution was adopted in the general election held on the first Monday in May, 1839.

The constitution, consisting of seventeen articles, is also one of the documents presented in the book. The preamble asked for entrance into the Union, saying that it was "consistent with the principles of the Federal Constitution, and by virtue of the Treaty of Amity, Settlement, and Limits between the United States of America and the King of Spain" (p. 303). Florida's entrance into the Union did not come until March 3, 1845, however, when Congress passed a law providing that "the States of Iowa and Florida be and the same are hereby, declared to be States of the United States of America" (p. 426).

William T. Cash, Florida State Librarian, has written a lengthy foreword to the book, in which he describes social life in Florida in 1845; and in the introduction, Miss Dodd has interpreted the various documents in a splendid fashion, and has shown the slow but steady progress made by the territory during its wait for statehood.

This is by no means a complete collection of all the documents relating to Florida's entrance into the Union, but it does include those of greatest significance. Dr. Clarence E. Carter's compilation of Florida territorial papers, when finished, will be much more elaborate. The book includes some very interesting illustrations, and a satisfactory index.

University of Georgia

SIDNEY WALTER MARTIN

*The Beleaguered City: Richmond, 1861-1865.* By Alfred Hoyt Bill. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1946. Pp. xxi, 313, xviii. Illustrations, maps, notes, bibliography. \$3.00.)

It is human, but perhaps unfortunate, that authors usually strain facts to justify theses. This sometimes leads to a confused idea of history, a modeling of history in a shape often discordant with the truth. In the present work the author presents the thesis that Richmond was a "beleaguered city" throughout the Civil War. "From 1861 to 1865," he says, "the story of Richmond is the story of a siege"; and he asserts that General Grant believed the capture of the Confeder-

ate capital rather than the destruction of the Army of Northern Virginia to be "the quicker way to end the war."

This statement may well be challenged. The war could just as easily be described as a duel between Richmond and Washington rather than as the investment of a single city. With an appropriate selection of facts it could be shown that Washington was in far more danger in August-September, 1861, than was Richmond; indeed, only the supineness of the Confederate high command kept the southern troops from entering Washington. Richmond was not in jeopardy until McClellan approached it at the end of May, 1862. It was in straits for the month of June, but McClellan's retreat soon relieved the situation. In September, 1862, Washington was in such imminent danger of capture that the Federal authorities were preparing to evacuate the capital when McClellan saved the situation by taking command of the Union army routed at the Second Manassas. Lee would almost certainly have taken the city if he had had siege artillery. In June-July, 1863, Washington was in evident peril and could hardly have been saved if Lee had won at Gettysburg. Again, in July, 1864, Early reached Washington and could easily have captured it if his force had been larger.

From May, 1861, to June, 1864, Richmond was in peril only for the month of June, 1862. The investment of Richmond was the alternative finally taken by Grant in 1864 when he found that he could not defeat Lee in the field. It was then, and only then, that he adopted McClellan's policy of siege and carried this to a successful conclusion. And in the end, success was due as much to the collapse of the Confederacy in the West as to any failure in the Confederate defense of the southern capital. But Mr. Bill makes the statement that the fall of Richmond would have ended the war at any time. This is doubtful. Both Davis and Lee expected the war to continue after the evacuation of the capital, and if Lee and Johnston together had defeated Sherman this would have happened.

The author has made a good book out of the sources on Richmond in the war period. He describes the reactions of the city to the varying fortunes of the war. He co-ordinates the events of the war with the life of the people in Richmond. He paints scenes in interesting fashion. He has much to say about the notables of the day, including President Davis. He gives graphic pictures of living conditions in the days of blockade-produced want. He tells of the depreciation of the currency. He gives pictures of social functions, taken mainly from that most delightful of all books, Mrs. Chesnut's *Dairy from Dixie*. It is a moving kaleidoscope of a capital city in a great war.

The work, however, is not as complete a panorama of life in Richmond in 1861-1865 as it might have been. In the first place, there is too much of the general and not enough of the specific in the narrative. Again, Mr. Bill wrote

his book far from Richmond and without much knowledge of contemporary Richmond life. Lastly, he relies on newspapers, but on editorials and not on general news. The journals of Richmond in that period, especially the *Examiner*, are rich in local information that throws light on the life of the people, especially the less exalted people, that cannot be obtained elsewhere. In 1864, for instance, Richmond was filled with a strange wartime population of many sorts. Hundreds of deserters from both armies were in the city and sometimes fought small battles in saloons and brothels. Gambling houses were everywhere—the only beneficent gambling houses in all history, for they provided food and drink for patrons who lost nothing but money that was already becoming worthless. Gambling dens and night clubs were raided precisely as such places are raided today. The Negroes, free and slave, happily exempt from the military draft, ran wild in Richmond in 1864, practically the only people that had any money except speculators. The newspapers bitterly condemned them for their dandyism; Negro youths carried canes and wore patent leather shoes while white gentlemen starved and went in rags. The world turned upside down indeed! Because the author has not included this rich historical material, his study is not finished. While he has written a good book, it could have been made much better, and could have made a genuine contribution to history.

The illustrations, taken mostly from *Harper's Weekly* and *The London Illustrated News*, are excellent.

Richmond, Virginia

H. J. ECKENRODE

*Lincoln and the South.* By James G. Randall. (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1946. Pp. viii, 161. Illustrations. \$1.50.)

When James G. Randall was invited to deliver the Walter Lynwood Fleming lectures at Louisiana State University in 1945, it was natural that he should choose the relationship of Lincoln to the South as his theme. At the time when the lectures were presented, his two-volume work on *Lincoln the President, Springfield to Gettysburg* was already in press, and he had fully elaborated certain points of emphasis, previously undeveloped, as to Lincoln's position on slavery and Lincoln's affiliations with the South. Although much of this is treated in the larger work, the lectures gave an opportunity for bringing together the various factors in Lincoln's background and career which especially related to the southern region. A sharpness of focus was thus attained, and it was also possible to include the plans for peace with the South, developed during the last months of Lincoln's life, and therefore not included in the full-scale biography which has as yet extended only to Gettysburg.

The value of these lectures lies in the fact that they combat certain deeply intrenched stereotypes which have remained long after the spirit of sectional

animosity ceased to pervade Civil War history. In the dualism created by the Civil War it was natural to "type" Lincoln as northern leader against the South, as the Emancipator striking the shackles from the slaves. Professor Randall neatly summarizes this traditional view with his quotation from an old Alabama Negro who said, "I don't know nothin' 'bout Abe Lincoln 'ceptin' dey say he sot us free, an' I don't know nothin' 'bout dat neither." It required more exact information than the stereotype provides, more discriminating analysis, and more balanced judgment, to recognize the important, though secondary, elements of Southernism in Lincoln's life and personality, or to evaluate the reluctance and the qualifications which surrounded the Emancipation Proclamation. With respect to the South, Lincoln was a native of Kentucky; husband of a southern girl; law-partner, successively, of three natives of Kentucky; devotee of Henry Clay; and it is said that his speech was the idiom of Kentucky. As an emancipator, he delayed to sound the battle cry of freedom, and rigidly restricted the geographical scope of his act of manumission. Even after emancipation, he proposed emigration for the freedmen and resisted the extension of citizenship rights to them.

It is a basic problem for the historian that his history tends to present issues in terms of sweeping alternatives (such as freedom and slavery), with one extreme to be chosen, while public affairs tend to be conducted in terms of dilemmas (such as a policy so weak as to allow secession, or one so severe as to prevent later reconciliation), with both extremes to be avoided. This anomaly has sharply limited the value of much of our political history and especially of Civil War history. It is an evidence of the unusual balance, maturity, and insight of Professor Randall's scholarship that he has avoided this fallacy of the alternatives as effectively as any American political historian now active in the profession. *Lincoln and the South* admirably illustrates the importance of his methods of evaluation in the reinterpretation of the sectional conflict.

Yale University

DAVID M. POTTER

*General George Crook: His Autobiography*. Edited by Martin F. Schmitt. (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1946. Pp. xviii, 326. Illustrations, maps, appendices, bibliography. \$3.00.)

Recently Sergeant Martin F. Schmitt resurrected a bulky manuscript from the files of the Army War College Library, which he has edited under the title, *General George Crook: His Autobiography*. Although Crook's own narrative covers those years from his graduation from West Point in 1852 to his fight with the Sioux Indians at the Rosebud, on June 18, 1876, Sergeant Schmitt sketches well the earlier and later parts of his life, drawing from source materials of the Army War College Library, the National Archives, and elsewhere.

Sergeant Schmitt writes very briefly of Crook's life prior to his entering West Point. The autobiography begins with Crook's first assignment at Governor's Island. As no other army officer has done, Crook writes with a trenchant pen of his western experiences. For a time he stayed in the roaring mining supply town of San Francisco; he visited the camps of the argonauts; and he broke new paths through the Sierra Nevadas and found the hidden retreats of the warring Indians. At points his narrative dips into garrulity but elsewhere it mounts to the high plane of brilliant, vivid narration. He writes interestingly of the Rogue River War (pp. 13-82); of the part he played in the Civil War (pp. 83-141); and of his return to the West to chase Paiutes, Apaches, and Sioux in 1866 (pp. 142-95). But he was never too busy to stop occasionally to jot down what he felt, heard, and saw, describing men and events in realistic terms.

This reviewer has the feeling that neither the conditions in the army nor in federal-Indian relations were quite as bad as described by Crook. Nor was Crook quite as faultless in his own leadership. At but few points does he pay tribute to officers and men with whom he served. Curiously enough, he eulogizes the cavalry operating in Arizona against the Apaches, although he consigns the Indians to the role of thieving beggars. To him Cochise and Eskiminzin were cutthroats and scoundrels. One needs to temper this harsh appraisal by reading Ralph H. Ogle's *Federal Control of the Western Apaches, 1848-1886*, and Woodworth Clum's apologetic *Apache Agent*. Both of these writers portray Cochise and Eskiminzin as great Indian characters and leaders.

In buttressing Crook's narrative of Indian wars, Sergeant Schmitt relies on War Department source materials in the National Archives and the Army War College. One might well suggest that Indian Bureau materials, also in the National Archives, might have given better balance to his annotations. But on the whole he does his work skillfully. He concludes the narrative by telling of Crook's return to the Apache country, of the end of the Arizona war, and of Crook's final assignments.

University of Oklahoma

CARL COKE RISTER

*The Centennial Edition of the Works of Sidney Lanier*. Volumes I to X. Charles R. Anderson, General Editor. Volume I, *Poems*, edited by Charles R. Anderson (pp. xc, 396). Volume II, *The Science of English Verse and Essays on Music*, edited by Paull F. Baum (pp. xlviii, 341). Volume III, *Shakspeare and His Forerunners*, edited by Kemp Malone (pp. xxiv, 419). Volume IV, *The English Novel and Essays on Literature*, edited by Clarence Gohdes and Kemp Malone (pp. xi, 400). Volume V, *Tiger-Lilies and Southern Prose*, edited by Garland Greever with the assistance of Cecil Abernethy (pp. lx, 358). Volume VI, *Florida and Miscellaneous Prose*,

edited by Philip Graham (pp. xxv, 412). Volumes VII to X, *Letters*, edited by Charles R. Anderson and Aubrey H. Starke (pp. lxiii, 400, 446, 511, 538). (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1945. Illustrations, appendices, textual variants, calendar of letters, bibliography. \$30.00 the set.)

If our biographers and social historians are to write with authority about the men who have made American literature, they must first have access to definitive texts. The instance of Nathaniel Hawthorne is a case in point. Before Professor Randall Stewart published his editions of the American and English *Notebooks* of this author, what Hawthorne had actually set down in them was not available. When Professor Stewart has completed his task of deciphering the letters, and when the Italian notebooks are similarly freed from the deletions and revisions of the novelist's prim Victorian wife and literary executor, we may expect a fully reliable biography—not before.

The story goes somewhat less drastically in the case of Lanier: at least he was never bowdlerized. Moreover, he received sympathetic treatment as early as 1905 in a biography by Edwin Mims. Aubrey H. Starke's considerably more elaborate *Sidney Lanier; A Biographical and Critical Study* (1933) did not alter in any essential way the pioneering investigations of his forerunner. Obviously, however, both men were handicapped to an extent by the absence of such carefully compiled information as is evident in the present volumes, all of them the work of distinguished scholars. The general supervision of Professor Anderson, it should be added, appears balanced and discriminating throughout.

The primary interest of historians in Lanier will likely center upon his correspondence. This seems particularly true since, with the exception of his essay, "The New South"—a plea for a program of small-scale subsistence farming—and several dialect poems on the general subject of agriculture, one can find little in his creative work to identify him with his age, so preoccupied did he become with his two private worlds of music and verse making. Yet the letters tell the familiar story of the older type of southern poet, a story which the careers of Hayne and Timrod closely parallel. Condensed, this story may be characterized as one which revolved endlessly about the several spectres of a limited and derivative talent to begin with, an indifferent audience, poverty, disease, and comparatively early death.

What Lanier actually wrote about the Civil War, in which he served four years, suffering capture and imprisonment, is indicative of his temperament to a remarkable degree. In December, 1860, he declared to his father: "I am a full-blooded secessionist. I think it the merest folly to bring the Black-Republican Party to terms, by any system of reprisal, in any shape." At the end of his college year at Oglethorpe he joined a militia company, the Macon Volunteers.

He suffered keenly under the hardships and uncertainties of war, but his



optimism about the prospects of a southern victory sustained him at least as late as August, 1864. At that time he wrote his father from Petersburg:

Yet, I rejoice in the Peace-party, not because of any results which I expect directly from its operations in favor of our independence, but simply because it is an infallible indication of a wide-spreading belief in the ability of the South to *win* its independence *by force of arms*—. The true and effective Peace-party is led, not by Mr. Long, but by Gen. Lee. This noble Fugleman, with his ragged constituency, who combine filth with heroism, in such a way as the world has not before seen, who vote by bullet and not by ballot, who thunder from the Earthworks and not from the Hustings; This innovating politician who discards bribery, who spreads not soft-soap, who pulls not the concealed wires, who confers no lucrative positions, who makes no shoddy contracts, who rejects all the old and well-established "mechanical appliances" of Party, that is the man, these are the voters, who are to give us peace and to establish our independence—. Nor have we long to wait, before the end comes— . . . The campaign is nearly over; its last battles are to be fought in a few weeks at farthest—. The crisis is come—. The Western Continent is in labor; the awe and agony of child-birth are upon her—. But I believe that by the New Year,/65, the gigantic throes will cease, and it will be announced to the World-Family that another son is born into it—.

Perhaps in his failure to see the coming calamity rests the secret of his failure as an artist. At any rate, his subsequent achievement reflects the dispersal of a harassed talent, a dispersal that persisted until death. Frustrated by disease and poverty, he taught school in Alabama, sought to recover his health in Texas, lectured at Johns Hopkins University, and played in the Peabody Symphony Orchestra in Baltimore. Yet what in a fundamental sense he lacked, no man or different set of circumstances, one suspects, could have afforded him. What he accomplished in a positive sense is available for all to examine in the present distinguished collection of his works.

Vanderbilt University

RICHMOND CROOM BEATTY

*The Wilson Era: Years of War and After, 1917-1923.* By Josephus Daniels. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1946. Pp. xviii, 654. Illustrations. \$4.00.)

This is the fourth installment of the recollections of Josephus Daniels. Preceding this volume there appeared *Tar-Heel Editor*, *Editor in Politics*, and *The Wilson Era: Years of Peace*, and there will follow probably a fifth segment of this Southerner's extended and illustrious life. Daniels writes as a southern editor; he even calls himself, when he was serving in Wilson's cabinet, the editor-in-chief of the United States Navy.

In an autobiography it is unusual to assign the major role to another individual, but the author has given Woodrow Wilson the center of the stage in this volume. The first section is devoted to an over-simplified but worth-while explanation of Wilson. The final part of the volume, evidently an afterthought, deals with the Chief Executive "at home." Since Daniels was an admirer, an associate, and a loyal friend of Woodrow Wilson, it is not surprising that he has failed to present a critical evaluation of Wilson or of the part he played on the stage of his time.

No hitherto unrevealed information is presented, nor is there any attempt to give the reader a continuous, coherent narrative of the role of the American navy in World War I, although many of the achievements of our navy during Wilson's administration are related. Especially worthy of note was the successful closing of the North Sea by an American mine barrage at a cost of \$80,000,000. The transportation of the American Expeditionary Forces to Europe without the loss of a single troopship was an almost unbelievable feat. In Daniels' opinion, all of this was made possible because of civilian control.

Some of the unethical, often downright dishonest, practices of England and France in dealing with the United States are frankly related. From the day our destroyers arrived in Ireland, England left the Atlantic Ocean to us and withdrew her fleet to Scapa Flow. After the war England wanted the United States to agree to her continued naval supremacy—a condition which Daniels opposed vigorously. According to Daniels, France actually sought to charge the United States rent on the trenches which the Yanks occupied in driving the enemy out of *la belle France*. Clemenceau's anti-Wilson activities at the Paris Peace Conference are well known, and little information is added here.

At home, the Secretary of the Navy was busily attempting to control the steel trust. Furthermore, both the coal companies and the tobacco trusts were raising prices as high as possible, and the petroleum corporations perturbed the Secretary by their pilfering of western naval oil reserves. Daniels stood adamant against such profiteering and dishonesty.

Other authors have suggested various explanations for Senator Henry Cabot Lodge's determination to defeat the League of Nations. Daniels gives three: (1) With Wilson in politics Lodge became a scholar in politics not *the* scholar, as before; (2) Lodge feared that Wilson would break the no third term presidential precedent; (3) Lodge was ambitious to achieve the presidency for himself. Daniels charges that while Wilson wanted to keep us out of war, Lodge willfully kept us out of peace.

This volume could have been shortened greatly without loss of historical value. It is generously illustrated with pictures and cartoons. There are no footnotes, but the index is ample.

*All These People: The Nation's Human Resources in the South.* By Rupert B. Vance. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1945. Pp. xxxvi, 503. Tables, charts, maps, bibliography. \$5.00.)

Any review of this book should begin with a reference to Howard W. Odum's *Southern Regions*, for Vance's work covers essentially the same area and subject matter. *All These People* should prove even more useful than Odum's work to the historian and the general reader, because Vance has carried the analysis much farther, is more direct in his presentation, and is far less repetitious. Indeed, few books by sociologists equal this latest production of one of the South's outstanding scholars. The volume is well worth reading by everyone interested in the South and in southern people, but for the historian, the economist, the political scientist, the geographer, and the sociologist, it is a "must."

The title and subtitle are somewhat misleading, for the book is not devoted to demographic questions nearly to the extent that they suggest. This is indicated by an analysis of the framework of the volume. The chapters are 32 in number, conveniently grouped into five parts. Part I, "The Dynamics of Population," occupies 153 pages of the 503-page total. The titles of its eleven chapters are as follows: "Human Resources and Social Values"; "How the People Grew" (this heading is ambiguous—it refers to growth of population, not to the development of their bodies); "The Record of the Decade"; "Male and Female"; "The Young, the Old, and the Mature"; "The Trend of Fertility"; "Family Size and Replacements"; "The Pattern of High Fertility"; "Moving Across the Map" (another ambiguous title—the chapter deals only with migration); "The Trend of Southern Migration"; and "The Changing Occupational Distribution."

Part II, entitled "Population and the Agrarian Economy," is concerned with several of the basic topics of rural social economics. The titles of its five chapters are: "Farm Population and the Land Use Pattern"; "The Supporting Capacity of the Crop System"; "Men, Mules, and Machines"; "Tenancy—A Foot-hold on the Land"; and "Race, Class, and Tenure."

Comparable analyses for the urban problems of the region make up Part III, "Population and the Industrial Economy." The five chapters in this section carry the titles: "Income and Industry"; "Industrialization of Rural Areas"; "The Rise of an Industrial Community"; "The Effects of Industrialization"; and "Population and Unemployment."

Nine chapters given over to basic analyses of health, education, and leadership make up Part IV, which is entitled "Cultural Adequacy of the People." Their informing titles are: "Health and Vitality of the People"; "Health among the Elders"; "The Task of Public Health"; "The Education of the People"; "Education and Cultural Adequacy"; "Closing the Gap in Southern Education"; "The Economics of Education"; "From the Grass Roots to the College"; and "Leadership and Cultural Development."

Part V, "Social Policy and Regional-National Planning," is the conclusion. One of its two chapters considers "The Formulation of Regional-National Population Policy," and the other indicates that there is "Wanted: The Nation's Future for the South."

Short (absolutely inadequate) "Bibliographic Notes" and a "General Index to the Text" complete the volume. Statistical material is abundantly used, the total number of tables running to 146, and the number of diagrams to 281. The charts, especially, are well chosen and add much to the simplicity and clarity of the presentation.

This reviewer is in agreement with Vance on the great majority of the issues raised in the book. On several smaller, technical matters, however, there is some disagreement. For example, "internal migration" is not a direct, primary factor in population increase (p. 13). In population analysis, I believe it necessary to go farther than Vance has done in order to determine the relative importance of the factors of sex, race, and residence. I also question the desirability of following Sundbärg in the classification of populations as "progressive," "regressive," and "retrogressive" (p. 49). This scheme classifies any population as progressive if forty per cent or more of its people are under fifteen years of age. The concentration of population in the tender years of life is great where the birth rate and death rate are both extremely high. On this basis, China, India, and the Latin American countries stand out as extremely "progressive." Finally, I believe that inclusion of croppers among farm operators destroys the validity of the long series of tables and charts presented in Part II.

In closing it is well to refer again to Odum's famous book. *All These People* may not be—probably will not be—understood. But, like *Southern Regions*, it cannot be ignored.

Louisiana State University

T. LYNN SMITH

# Historical News and Notices

## THE ANNUAL MEETING

Plans for the program of the 1946 annual meeting of the Southern Historical Association, to be held in Birmingham, October 31 and November 1 and 2, reflect a wide range of interests and give promise of a vigorous resumption of the Association's activities in its first postwar meeting. The committee on program, of which Daniel M. Robison, Vanderbilt University, is chairman, has planned for six sessions on various aspects of the history of the South; a round table discussion of book reviewing; three sessions in the field of European history; and one luncheon and two dinner programs.

The meeting will officially begin at 2:45 P. M. on Thursday, October 31, with two sessions on southern history. In one of these, the theme will be "The Progressive Movement in the South," with George C. Osborn, Memphis State College, discussing "James K. Vardaman, Progressive Governor of Mississippi, 1904-1908," and Arthur S. Link, Princeton University, presenting a paper on "Woodrow Wilson and Progressive Democracy in the South, 1910-1912." The other, dealing with "Some Aspects of Life and Labor in the Old South," will consist of a paper by Herbert Weaver, Georgia State Teachers College, on "Foreigners in the Ante-Bellum Towns of the Lower South," and one by J. Carlyle Sitterson, University of North Carolina, on "Lewis Thompson and His Louisiana Plantation, 1848-1888; A Study in Absentee Ownership."

On Thursday evening the members will be the guests of Howard College at a complimentary dinner. President Harwell Davis, Jr., of Howard College will preside, and an address will be given by Edward E. Dale, University of Oklahoma, on "Cherokees in the Confederacy."

The Friday morning program consists of a session on "Scientific Agriculture in the Old South," with a paper on "Some Practical Applications of Scientific Agricultural Theories in the Old South," by Bennett H. Wall, University of Kentucky, and one on "Daniel Lee and Scientific Agriculture in the South," by Nannie M. Tilley, Duke University; and of a session on "The Crusades," in which Harold S. Fink, University of Tennessee, will present a paper on "The First Crusade," and Curtis H. Walker, Vanderbilt University, one on "Eleanor of Aquitaine and the Second Crusade." At a complimentary luncheon given by Birmingham-Southern College and presided over by George R. Stuart, Jr., president of the College, Francis B. Simkins, Farmville (Virginia) State Teachers College, will speak on "The Everlasting South."

Three sessions have been scheduled for Friday afternoon, all of them to be held on the campus of Birmingham-Southern College. One of these will be a round table discussion on the topic, "A General Appraisal of Travel Accounts as Historical Source Material," with Charles S. Sydnor, Duke University, Fletcher M. Green, University of North Carolina, James W. Patton, North Carolina State College, and possibly one other participant, leading the discussion. Another session, scheduled at the same time, will deal with "The Free Negro." The papers will be on "The Question of Slavery and the Free Negro in the Tennessee Constitutional Convention of 1834," by Chase C. Mooney, Indiana University, and "Motives for the Manumission of Slaves in Two Border States," by J. Merton England, University of Kentucky. The third session will be devoted to a discussion of "The Renaissance Problem," with Loren C. MacKinney, University of North Carolina, and Ernest W. Nelson, Duke University, as the speakers.

At the annual dinner of the Association, on Friday evening, Ella Lonn, Goucher College, will deliver her presidential address on "Reconciliation between the North and the South."

The program for Saturday morning also provides for three sessions. One of these will be a round table discussion of book reviewing, with William T. Couch, University of Chicago Press, presenting "The Publisher's Point of View," Fred C. Cole, Tulane University, "The Editor's Point of View," and Frank L. Owsley, Vanderbilt University, "The Reviewer's Point of View." A session on "Discontent and Conservatism in the Old South" will include a paper on "Francis Lieber's Discontent with the Old South," by William M. Geer, of the Division of Records and Publications, United States Department of State, and one on "Conservative Constitutional Tendencies of the Virginia Secession Convention," by Henry T. Shanks, Birmingham-Southern College. In a session on "Some Problems of Recent Europe," John F. Ramsey, University of Alabama, will discuss "Background of the Spanish Civil War," and George B. Carson, University of Kentucky, will deal with "Changing Perspective of Soviet Historiography."

The annual business session and election of officers, to be held immediately following a luncheon on Saturday, will bring the meeting to a close.

The headquarters for the meeting will be at the Tutwiler Hotel, but because of the continued crowded conditions it will be necessary to distribute those who attend among the various hotels of the city. The hotels have requested that all reservations be made through Professor Joseph H. Parks, Birmingham-Southern College.

#### PERSONAL

The Committee on Grants-in-Aid of Research of the Institute of Early American History and Culture has made the following awards for 1946-1947: Douglass G. Adair, of the College of William and Mary, for the completion of a book

on "The Intellectual Backgrounds of Jeffersonian Democracy"; Lewis Leary, of Duke University, for the completion of a study of "The Life of St. George Tucker and an Edition of His Writings"; and William G. North, of the Dublin School, Dublin, New Hampshire, for the completion of a manuscript on the "Political and Social Backgrounds of the Dartmouth College Case."

Wendell H. Stephenson, of the University of Kentucky, has accepted an appointment as chairman of the division of social sciences and professor of southern history at Tulane University, effective September 1.

Bernard Mayo, of the University of Virginia, has been granted a leave of absence for the year 1946-1947 to serve as visiting professor of history at Harvard University, and Thomas P. Govan, now on leave from the University of the South, has been appointed acting professor of history for the year to carry on his work at Virginia. Oron J. Hale, who returns to the University of Virginia from four years of military service, has been promoted to the rank of professor of European history, and Edward Younger, who has been teaching at the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis, has been added to the staff as assistant professor of history.

Recent changes at Louisiana State University include the appointment of Bell Irwin Wiley, who has been on leave from the University of Mississippi for service with the Historical Division of the Army Ground Forces, to be professor of history and head of the department, succeeding Walter Prichard, who relinquished the position to become the first incumbent of the newly-created chair of Francis Xavier Martin professor of Louisiana history. Lynn M. Case, recently returned from a leave of absence for military service, has resigned to accept an appointment as associate professor of European history at the University of Pennsylvania. Edwin A. Davis has given up his position as archivist of the University to return to full-time teaching duties as associate professor of history, and William R. Hogan, who recently returned from a leave of absence for service in the Army, has been promoted to the position of University archivist.

Carey V. Stabler, assistant professor of history at Alabama College, Montevallo, who has been on leave of absence for service in the Navy, has been appointed assistant to the president of the College.

Florence Janson Sherriff, former professor of government at St. John's University, Shanghai, China, and at Rockford College, Rockford, Illinois, has been made head of the department of history and government at Wesleyan College, Macon, Georgia, effective in February, 1946. She has been associate professor of history and government at Wesleyan College since her repatriation from China in February, 1944. Mrs. Gerhardt Busch, a candidate for the doctorate at the University of Chicago, has been added to the staff at Wesleyan as associate professor of history and art.

Recent personnel changes in the staff of the Alderman Library of the University of Virginia include the return of John Cook Wyllie from four years' service in the British and United States armies to resume his position as curator of the Tracy W. McGregor Library and curator of rare books for the University; the appointment of Francis L. Berkeley, Jr., recently released from the Navy, as curator of manuscripts; and the appointment of William H. Gaines, Jr. as senior assistant in charge of manuscripts.

Numerous other appointments which have recently been made are also of interest to the members of the Southern Historical Association. Joseph J. Mathews, who has been on leave of absence from the University of Mississippi for service as a historical officer in the Navy, has accepted an appointment as professor of European history at Emory University. Harvey A. DeWeerd, formerly editor of *Military Affairs*, and more recently historical officer with the Army Chief of Staff, has been appointed professor of history at the University of Missouri. Chase C. Mooney, now at Southern Methodist University, has been appointed assistant professor of history at Indiana University. John Harold Wolfe, of Limestone College, has accepted an appointment as professor of history at Winthrop College, Rock Hill, South Carolina. Horace Montgomery, who has been at Oglethorpe University during the past year, will assume his duties as professor of history in the California (Pennsylvania) State Teachers College in September. R. John Rath, formerly at Mississippi State College for Women and more recently with the UNRRA in Europe, will begin his work as assistant professor of European history at the University of Georgia this fall. Harold S. Fink, of Hibbing Junior College, Minnesota, has been appointed assistant professor of history at the University of Tennessee. Edward O. Guerrant, formerly at the California School of Technology and more recently with the State Department in Washington, D. C., has been made associate professor of history and international relations at Davidson College. Harold S. Schultz, formerly of Elon College, has accepted an appointment as assistant professor of history at the University of Vermont. Charles H. Moffat, a recent doctoral graduate of Vanderbilt University, has been appointed associate professor of history at Marshall College, Huntington, West Virginia.

Chalmers G. Davidson has been promoted to the rank of professor of history and director of the library at Davidson College. Other recent promotions which have been announced are: Daniel M. Robison, Vanderbilt University, James W. Silver, University of Mississippi, and Granville T. Prior, The Citadel, to be professor of history; and Robert G. Lunde, University of Kentucky, Henry L. Swint, Vanderbilt University, Charles G. Summersell, University of Alabama, Weymouth T. Jordan, Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Glenn N. Sisk, Georgia School of Technology, and Ward T. Morton, University of Arkansas, to be associate professor of history.



Leaves of absence have been granted by the University of Kentucky to Shelby T. McCloy, to continue research on eighteenth century France under the auspices of a Social Science Research Council fellowship; to William F. Church, to accept a Guggenheim fellowship for research in the field of British and Continental history; and to Albert D. Kirwan, to continue his graduate study at Duke University. Christiana McFadyen, of the Woman's College of the University of North Carolina, has also been granted a leave of absence to complete her work for the doctorate at the University of Chicago, where she has been awarded the Wolf fellowship in history.

Samuel G. Riley, who has been professor of history and head of the department at Meredith College, Raleigh, North Carolina, since 1920, retired in June after forty-five years of college teaching. Before going to Meredith College he had taught at the Jacksonville (Alabama) State Teachers College, at Stephens College, and at Brenau College.

Among those returning to their positions this fall from leaves of absence are the following: at Duke University, Bayrd Still, Richard L. Watson, and Arthur B. Ferguson, who have been with the Historical Division of the Army Air Forces, and Harold T. Parker, who has been with the Army Transport Command in the Pacific area; at the University of North Carolina, J. Carlyle Sitterson, who has been with the War Production Board; at the University of Arkansas, William C. Askew, who has been serving as an officer in the Navy; at Maryville College, Verton M. Queener, who has been connected with the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the Department of Agriculture; and at Davidson College, Bradley D. Thompson, who has been on leave for graduate study and who has been acting professor of history at Mary Baldwin College during the past year.

For the first time since 1941, migrations for summer school teaching have returned to the academic picture this year. Among the summer appointments which have been announced, the following are of interest to members of the Association: Fletcher M. Green, of the University of North Carolina, to teach at the University of Missouri; Bernard Mayo, of the University of Virginia, to teach at Columbia University; E. Merton Coulter, of the University of Georgia, to teach at the University of Texas; Louis B. Schmidt, of Iowa State College, to teach at the University of Alabama; Clement Eaton, of Lafayette College, to teach at the University of North Carolina; Thomas P. Govan, of the University of the South, to teach at the University of Virginia; S. Walter Martin, of the University of Georgia, to teach at the University of Florida; Kenneth M. Stamp, of the University of Maryland, to teach at the University of Wisconsin; Horace Montgomery, of Oglethorpe University, and Lucien E. Roberts, of West Georgia College, to teach at the University of Georgia; Alice B. Keith, of Meredith College, to teach at Howard College; Louis T. Merrill, of Beloit College, and Hamilton P. Easton, of Amherst College, to teach at the University of Arkansas;

and William D. McCain, of the Mississippi Department of Archives and History, to teach at the University of Mississippi.

Thomas Dixon, prolific writer of historical novels dealing with the Reconstruction period in the South, died in Raleigh, North Carolina, on April 3, 1946, at the age of eighty-two. Before turning to the writing of fiction, he had pursued graduate study in history at Johns Hopkins University, and had been a lawyer, a minister, and a lyceum lecturer. His first novel was *The Leopard's Spots*, published in 1902, and his best-known work was *The Clansman* (1905), upon which the moving picture "The Birth of a Nation" was based.

William Kirk Woolery, head of the department of history and political science at Bethany College, West Virginia, died on May 20, at the age of fifty-seven. A graduate of Bethany College, he did graduate work at the University of California, where he received the M.A. degree in 1915, and at Johns Hopkins University, where he received the Ph.D. degree in 1926. He taught in high schools in Ohio, West Virginia, and California; was assistant professor of history at Bethany College from 1921 to 1925; became professor and head of the department in 1925; served as dean of the College from 1930 to 1936; and as provost from 1936 to his death. He was the author of *The Relation of Thomas Jefferson to American Foreign Policy*, published in 1927 by the Johns Hopkins Press.

Louis Pelzer, professor of history at the State University of Iowa, who was known best to the members of this Association as the managing editor of the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, died suddenly at his home in Iowa City on June 28. His research interests were in the field of western history, in which he published several books. He was president of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association in 1935-1936, and was chairman of the special committee which formulated the comprehensive report on "Projects in American History and Culture," published by that Association in 1945.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHICAL

Among the recent accessions to the Division of Manuscripts in the Library of Congress the following, arranged in chronological order of materials, may be of interest to students of southern history: microfilm of papers of, and relating to, Thomas Jefferson, April 30, 1775, to 1856 (originals in the possession of the American Philosophical Society); seventeen letters of Hessian officers in the British army, 1777 to 1781; three letters from Charles Pinckney, December 18, 1786, June 16, 1803, and March 8, 1820; one hundred and forty-six papers pertaining to land grants and titles mainly in Russell and Scott counties, Virginia, 1787 to 1893; letter from Henry Knox to Winthrop Sargent, February 21, 1796; letter from John Henry to James McHenry, April 3, 1797; photostat of genealogical notes relating to the Westfall family, 1800 to 1911; letter from Thomas

Claxton to Wilson Cary Nicholas, February 26, 1801; letter from Thomas Posey to his children and grandchildren, February 4, 1814, with biographical matter; seventy-three papers of Waddy Thompson, including letters from William C. Preston, Hugh S. Legaré, Andrew Pickens Butler, and others, 1832 to 1857; additional papers of John Rodgers, mainly papers concerning ships, reports of courts martial, muster rolls, and reports of stores; nine papers, mainly letters from George Bancroft to Jesse D. Elliott and others, 1845 to 1846; letter from Zachary Taylor to William M. Murphy and others, January 23, 1848; ten manuscript volumes, 1851 to 1865, relating to the activities of Gideon and Company (printers), and William D. Colt (notary, Washington, D. C.); two communications from the office of the United States Consul at the Port of San Juan del Sur, February 14 and 22, 1857, concerned with the efforts of the Central American Republics to expel William Walker from Nicaragua; photostat of a letter from Mary Lincoln to Caleb B. Smith, October 26, 1861; photostat of an autograph paper by Andrew Johnson regarding death, June 29, 1873; additional papers of George Bancroft and Alexander Bliss; about one hundred additional papers of Horatio King, pertaining to the activities of the Saturday Evening Literary Club of Washington, D. C., 1884 to 1887; nine papers from the correspondence of Alfred Thayer Mahan and Ellen Lyle Mahan, with Francis Vinton Greene, April 5, 1899, to April 12, 1915; microfilm of eight letters and photostats of two letters of Theodore Roosevelt, January 6, 1917, to December 5, 1918.

Recent additions to the manuscript collections of the University of Virginia include the following: three manuscript volumes listing and describing letters, deeds, and legal documents of the Fairfax family, 1535-1828; abstracts of Northumberland County, Virginia, wills and other records, 1700-1800, type-script, 2 vols.; papers of the Dame family of Virginia, 1718-1931, especially of the Rev. William Page Dame, C. S. A.; photostats of eight letters and documents, 1757-1859, of Robert Dinwiddie (1693-1770), John Tyler (1747-1813), Charles Carroll of Carrollton, Henry Lee (1756-1818), Henry Lee (1787-1837), William Wirt (1772-1834), George Washington Parke Custis (1781-1857), and James Buchanan (1791-1868); about 1000 additional papers of the Grinnan family, 1763-1907, with much material pertaining to the Bryan, Tucker, and Randolph families; 15 original manuscripts and about 7000 microfilm copies of Jefferson's manuscripts for addition to the Jefferson Collection; 500 papers, 1767-1849, of Callohill Mennis, lawyer, of Bedford County, Virginia, including letters relating to Washington Academy, Lexington, Virginia; photostats of three manuscripts, 1774-1862, involving Daniel Boone, George Washington, and Robert E. Lee, respectively; 500 additional papers, 1777-1870, of the Ambler family of Jamestown Island, Richmond, and Amherst County, Virginia; autograph letter, May 14, 1782, of James Madison, signed also by Theodorick Bland, Jr., to Governor Benjamin Harrison requesting instructions as to cession of

Virginia's western land, etc.; eight autograph letters, 1784, of James McHenry (1753-1816) describing life at Sweet Springs, Virginia; photoprints of nine autograph letters, 1786-1790, of Maria Cosway to Thomas Jefferson; five additional letters of the Eppes family, 1790-1820; correspondence, about 350 items, 1790-1860, of Asa Hillyer of Connecticut and his sons Asa, Jr., of New Jersey, Truman and Shaler of Georgia, James of New York and Maryland, and Justin of Ohio; two autograph letters of Patrick Henry, October 2, 1791, and February 4, 1794; manuscript volume, 1792-1797, kept by Battaile Muse recording the rents collected from and owed by Virginian tenants of the Fairfax family; 18 account books, 1794-1897, of merchants in Petersburg, Virginia; two autograph letters of 1797 and 1821 and manuscript notes by James Monroe on the state of the nation, 1823; manuscript letterbook, 1798-1799, of David Montagu Erskine (1776-1855), whose letters to his father give an English traveler's impressions of Norfolk, Richmond, Baltimore, and Philadelphia; Benjamin Stodert, autograph letter to James McHenry on Jefferson's attitude toward the Navy, July 20, 1802; four autograph letters of John Randolph of Roanoke, 1811-1831; five autograph letters of Henry Clay, 1811-1847; business and personal papers of Thomas Garland of Charlottesville, about 1500 items, 1820-1870; account book, 1825-1840, of Henry Turner of Loudoun County, Virginia (lying in the covers is much local and national paper money of the Confederacy); autograph albums, letters, clippings, and other materials for the University of Virginia Collection, 1827-1944, including minutes of the University chapter of the Sons of Temperance, 1847-1857; autograph letter, December 7, 1828, of Thomas Jefferson Randolph (1792-1875) to James Madison regarding Jefferson's library; 130 additional manuscripts, 1830-1860, for the William Weaver Papers, dealing with the iron industry in Rockbridge County, Virginia; 350 manuscripts, 1830-1900, of Joseph M. Seay, pertaining to the estate of John Halkett of Caroline County, Virginia; two autograph letters, 1833-1852, of Jacob Whitman Bailey (1811-1857) describing travels from Georgia to Virginia; 28 business papers, 1834-1865, of the firm of Bush and Lobdell of Wilmington, Delaware, relating to the iron industry and machinery manufacture in Northern Virginia; 170 manuscripts and prints, 1834-1908, for the Civil War Collection, papers chiefly of noted Confederate leaders; five legal manuscripts, on slave sales, etc., 1838-1868, of St. George Fitzhugh and John L. Marye, lawyers of Fredericksburg, Virginia; manuscript memoirs of Issac Jefferson, 1847, as dictated to Charles Campbell (1807-1876), recording his life as a slave at "Monticello" in charge of Jefferson's nail factory, his early training in Philadelphia as a tinsmith, with a daguerreotype; autograph letters of Thomas Walker, describing Hampton, Virginia, July 13, 1850; diary, 1850-1851, of Thompson E. F. Randolph describing a voyage to Europe and the Middle East in the barque *Cornelia*, typescript, 2 vols.; Civil War correspondence, 150 items, 1854-1865, chiefly of George Neville, C. S. A., from various Virginia towns; photostat of Robert E.

Lee's autograph letter to Colonel Samuel Couper, June 1, 1859; 2000 more papers for the James Gibson Johnson collection on secondary education in Virginia, 1870-1944; letterbook, 1877-1879, of Woods and Taylor, Charlottesville, Virginia, clothiers; five notebooks of Eugenie Hubbard (d. 1944), one from the Edgeworth School, Albemarle County, Virginia; papers of Pantops Academy, Albemarle County, 1888-1894, 38 items; 500 papers, manuscripts of articles and speeches, of Henry M. Hyde, newspaper man of Chicago and Washington, D. C., 1889-1943; 17 letterbooks, account books, and scrapbooks of James Alston Cabell, Richmond lawyer, 1890-1940; volume of notes, 1901, on the lectures of the Rev. R. W. Micou, D. D., of the Virginia Theological Seminary; 600 additional items for the World War I Collection, 1916-1920, including motion picture films of the Lafayette Escadrille; visitors' register of McGuffey School, Charlottesville, 1916-1930; three account books of the copra plantations of the Ulfa estate in the Solomon Islands, 1923-1934; 1000 papers, 1935-1943, to the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission concerning construction of the Memorial and its dedication by President Roosevelt, April 13, 1943; autograph letter, March 11, 1938, Sir Wilfred Grenfell to Blanche Randolph; 8000 additional papers for the World War II Collection, 1941-1945, containing much material relative to the military activities of Charlottesville, training programs at the University of Virginia, and the Eighth Evacuation Hospital; autograph letter, December 30, 1944, of Franklin D. Roosevelt; manuscript of *Central American Roundabout*, 1944, and miscellaneous items added to the Agnes Rothery Pratt Collection; letter of A. Lascelles, private secretary to the King of England, 1944, to Mrs. Raymond Gorges.

Among the records received recently by the National Archives are about 30,000 maps from the Office of the Chief of Engineers. Most of them are manuscript maps of surveys made throughout the United States by Army Engineers, 1800-1926. About a sixth of the maps relate to military affairs and the others to civil works. The Post Office Department has also transferred many of its older files, including records relating to the establishment of post offices and the appointment of postmasters, 1790-1930. Records of more recent date received include correspondence and maps of the American Battle Monuments Commission relating to military operations in France during World War I; central files of the Office of the Inspector General, War Department, 1917-1934; and additional records of the Office of War Information, including sound recordings of broadcasts made by Franklin D. Roosevelt, 1942-1945, and about 50,000 disks of sound recordings of broadcasts made by the Office of War Information to foreign countries, 1945.

Several more bodies of records in the custody of the Archivist have been reproduced on microfilm and microcopies of them may now be ordered. They include records of the General Land Office, consisting of letters sent to Surveyors General and miscellaneous letters sent, 1790-1860; records of the Office of the

Secretary of War, consisting of letters sent relating to military affairs and registers of letters received, 1800-1860; population schedules of the census of 1830 for Kentucky, Louisiana, South Carolina, and Virginia; records of the Wilkes Exploring Expedition, 1838-1842; and records of the Southern Claims Commission, 1871-1880.

The ninth and tenth annual reports of the Archivist of the United States for the fiscal years 1942-1943 and 1943-1944, which were not published during the war, are now available in processed form. Another recent publication of the National Archives is *Your Government's Records in the National Archives*, which contains summary descriptions of the more than 200 groups of records into which the holdings of the National Archives have been divided. Copies of these publications may be obtained upon request from the Assistant Administrative Secretary of the National Archives.

The Maryland Historical Society has recently received as a gift a large collection of items relating to the work of Benjamin Henry Latrobe and members of his family. Among them is the manuscript Notebook II of Latrobe's American Journal, covering the period from March 20 to May 31, 1796, which was not included in the published *Journal of Latrobe*. The gift also includes several watercolors by Latrobe and by his son, John H. B. Latrobe; and these items, coupled with the drawings and manuscripts already in the possession of the Society, form perhaps the largest group of Latrobe materials outside the possession of the Latrobe family.

Other manuscript materials acquired by the Society in recent months include: deeds and land papers, Baltimore and St. George counties, 1684-1853; King papers, 1731-1861, deeds and correspondence dealing with lands at Kingsville, Baltimore County, and in Pennsylvania and Mississippi; letter from Samuel Smith to James McHenry, December 10, 1778; additional letters of Captain Charles Ridgely, 1780-1792; Rodgers papers, 1794-1875, including business papers, Civil War muster rolls, and a series of bills for clothing bought in China and Japan during 1870-1875; letter from Thomas Truxton to James McHenry, May 20, 1798; papers dealing with Jehu Bouldin's proposed survey of Baltimore, 1812; letters from George Armistead and his sister to Mrs. Louisa Armistead, Fort McHenry, September, 1814; register of Trinity Episcopal Church, Baltimore, 1815-1836; letter from James Madison to Alexander C. Hanson, January 1, 1817; letterbook, 1825-1839, and two account books, 1824-1864, of Thomas Ferguson, Baltimore merchant; notebooks, account books, sermons, and legal correspondence of the Rev. William T. Brantley and William T. Brantley, Jr., 1827-1911; minute books (2 vols.) of the Govanstown Academy, 1835-1855; journal of Charles Eaton during travels in Europe, 1839-1841; letters between John Taylor, USN., and his father, Robert Taylor, Baltimore commission merchant, 1849-1855; miscellaneous letters and papers of the Ringgold family, Baltimore, 1849-1865; letters from the Rev. Robert A. Eden and Frederick M.

Eden to Dr. Bernard C. Steiner, 1893-1897; and issues of early Baltimore and Boston newspapers.

The Newberry Library, Chicago, has added to the Ayer Collection the papers of David Brydie Mitchell, governor of Georgia, 1809-1813, 1815-1817, and United States agent to the Creek Indians, 1817-1821. These include: 47 of Mitchell's own letters, 1777-1829; 42 letters from William H. Crawford to Mitchell, 1808-1822; 10 letters from George M. Troup; 8 letters from William R. Bullock; 7 from John Floyd; 34 letters from various other persons, including Thomas Pinckney, Andrew Jackson, George Graham, and seven Indian correspondents, 1794-1832.

The University of Tennessee Library has recently acquired one of the most extensive files in existence of the *Cherokee Phoenix*, 1828-1834, the newspaper published by the Cherokee Indians.

The latest *Bulletin of the American Association for State and Local History* (Vol. I, No. 10, April, 1946) carries the general title, "Church Archives and History," and contains an article on "The Historical Foundation of the Presbyterian and Reformed Churches," by Thomas H. Spence, Jr., which includes much information on activities in the South; an article entitled, "Behold There Shall Be a Record Kept among You," by Virgil Peterson, which deals with the records of the Mormon Church; and one on "Historical and Archival Activities of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States," by Thomas F. O'Connor. The series was prepared under the editorial direction of Herbert O. Brayer, of the Colorado State Museum.

*Blair House, Past and Present; An Account of Its Life and Times in the City of Washington* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1945, pp. 38, plates, \$1.00), is a handsomely printed brochure, prepared for the Department of State by Katharine Elizabeth Crane. It presents a brief sketch of the history of the famous house on Pennsylvania Avenue, and of the two families who owned it until its purchase by the United States in 1942 for use as the guest house of the Nation. Sixteen gravure illustrations of both exterior and interior views reveal the dignity of the house and its furnishings far more effectively than any text could hope to do. A special edition has also been printed for presentation to distinguished foreign visitors who are officially entertained by the United States Government at the Blair House.

*A Proclamation for Settling the Plantation of Virginia, 1625* (Charlottesville: The Tracy W. McGregor Library, University of Virginia, 1946, pp. 40), with an introduction by Thomas Cary Johnson, Jr., is a facsimile reproduction of the proclamation issued by Charles I on May 13, 1625, now recognized as the first of the imperial constitutions for the royal provinces in America. The introduction presents a general view of the historical setting of this proclamation, and a

note by John Cook Wyllie discusses in detail the printing variants in the dozen copies which are known to be extant. The University of Virginia printed 1000 copies, of which 50 were for sale at \$5.00 each; but the supply of sale copies was completely exhausted immediately after publication, with the result that the work is already out of print.

*Architects of Charleston* (Charleston: The Carolina Art Association, 1946, pp. xvi, 329, bibliography, \$5.00), by Beatrice St. Julien Ravenel, with an introduction by William Watts Ball and photographs by Carl Julien, presents a comprehensive view of the men who were responsible for the building of the homes which reflect the charm of Charleston culture of the ante-bellum period. It is based on careful research in historical records as well as upon appreciation of architectural accomplishments. The book will be of value not only to anyone interested in the history of building in South Carolina but also to every student of southern history. While it deals primarily with the period before 1860, the author has extended her study beyond that period in the case of those architects whose work was resumed after the Civil War.

*In Search of the Regional Balance of America* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1945, pp. viii, 162, \$3.00), edited by Howard W. Odum and Katherine Jocher, performs the threefold service of presenting a collection of essays on the South and its problems, a review of some of the most important work done in the past quarter of a century in the study of regionalism at one of the leading southern research centers, and a valuable bibliographical aid. Essays on the social pattern of the South, on the effect of social change on the region, and on the South as seen by a Northerner, are especially stimulating, and there is a convenient bibliography of the extensive and important work which has been done under the auspices of the Institute for Research in Social Science at the University of North Carolina.

*Theory and Practice in Historical Study: A Report of the Committee on Historiography* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1946, pp. xii, 177, bibliography, index, \$2.25 in cloth binding, \$1.75 in paper cover), is the outgrowth of a decision made by the committee "that it might best fulfill its obligations to the Council and to the historical profession by preparing a manual designed to help clarify thought about history and to aid historians in teaching and writing it" (p. vii). After considerable discussion and adjustment of original plans, the report has taken the form of a collection of essays by individuals in which more issues are raised than settled. In the first chapter, Charles A. Beard presents his view of "Grounds for a Reconsideration of Historiography" with his usual enthusiasm. This is followed by a discussion of "Controlling Assumptions in the Practice of American Historians," by John Herman Randall, Jr. and George Haines IV. Chapter III, entitled "What Historians Have Said about the Cause of the Civil War," by Howard K. Beale,



is included to provide a case study of the treatment of "causality" in specific historical works. In a chapter on "Problems of Terminology in Historical Writing," Beard presents a note on the need for greater precision in the use of historical terms, and Sidney Hook offers a trial glossary in which an effort is made to explain such terms as *analogy*, *cause*, *development*, *fact*, and *understanding*, as they appear in the historians' vocabulary. Chapter V presents twenty-one "Propositions," eight of which are classified as "basic premises"; six as "important sources of methodological error"; four as "desirable principles and techniques"; and three fall under the heading "history and related disciplines." A twenty-page "Selective Reading List" includes most of the books and some of the more important articles by both Europeans and Americans on historiography and the philosophy of history. In his Foreword, Merle Curti, the chairman of the committee, expresses the belief that the report may contribute to a fuller understanding of certain methodological problems in the writing of history, and a hope that it "will prove helpful to graduate students of history, to lay readers, and to the profession itself." It deserves thoughtful attention from all three of those groups.

#### ARTICLES ON THE STATES OF THE UPPER SOUTH

- "Politics in Maryland during the Civil War," continued, by Charles Branch Clark, in the *Maryland Historical Magazine* (June).
- "The Chesapeake Convoy System, 1662-1763," by Arthur Pierce Middleton, in the *William and Mary Quarterly* (April).
- "Baths and Watering Places of Colonial America," by Carl Bridenbaugh, *ibid.*
- "Cawsons, Virginia, in 1795-1796," by Marion Tinling, *ibid.*
- "Views of Yorktown and Gloucester Town, 1755," by Earl G. Swem, in the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* (April).
- "The Papers of Richard Evelyn Byrd I, of Frederick County, Virginia," by Everard Kidder Meade, *ibid.*
- "Journey to the Springs, 1846," by William D. Hoyt, Jr., *ibid.*
- "The Colonial Churches of Northumberland and Lancaster Counties, Virginia," by George Carrington Mason, *ibid.*
- "Secretary William Claiborne of Virginia," by Virginia Armistead Nelson, in *Tyler's Quarterly Historical and Genealogical Magazine* (April).
- "The West Virginia Gubernatorial Election Contest, 1888-1890," by James Henry Jacobs, in *West Virginia History* (April).
- "A. W. Campbell—Party Builder," by Myra Gladys Gray, *ibid.*
- "Richard Caswell: Versatile Leader of the Revolution," by C. B. Alexander, in the *North Carolina Historical Review* (April).
- "Eighteenth Century New Bern: A History of the Town and Craven County, 1700-1800, Part VI, New Bern as Colonial Capital," by Alonzo Thomas Dill, Jr., *ibid.*

- "Edwin A. Alderman—Liberal of the New South," by Clement Eaton, *ibid.*
- "The History of Settlement and Land Use in the Bent Creek Forest," by William A. Nesbit and Anthony Netboy, in *Agricultural History* (April).
- "Hog Raising and Hog Driving in the Region of the French Broad River," by Edmund Cody Burnett, *ibid.*
- "Tennessee's Sesquicentennial," by Governor Jim McCord, in the *Tennessee Historical Quarterly* (June).
- "A History of Zion Community in Maury County, 1806-1860," continued, by Mary Wagner Highsaw, *ibid.*
- "Benjamin Sebastian and the Spanish Conspiracy in Kentucky," by Elizabeth Warren, in the *Filson Club History Quarterly* (April).
- "Thomas Hunt Morgan: Kentucky's Gift to Biological Science," by Wendell H. Stephenson, *ibid.*
- "Pioneer Linns of Kentucky," continued, by George William Beattie and Helen Pruitt Beattie, *ibid.*
- "Otto Arthur Rothert, 1871- ; Secretary of the Filson Club, 1917-1945," by Hambleton Tapp, *ibid.*
- "Sesquicentennial of the Wilderness Road," by Russell Dyche, in the *Register of the Kentucky State Historical Society* (April).
- "Land Surveys of Daniel Boone," by Willard Rouse Jillson, *ibid.*
- "George Caleb Bingham's 'Order No. 11,' " by Dorothy Penn, in the *Missouri Historical Review* (April).
- "Pioneer Beginnings at Emmanuel, Shawnee," by Franklin C. Smith, in the *Chronicles of Oklahoma* (Spring).
- "Mary C. Greenleaf at Wapanucka Female Manual Labor School," by Carolyn Thomas Foreman, *ibid.*
- "Memories of George W. Mayes," by Harold Keith, *ibid.*
- "The Hawkins Negroes Go to Mexico: A Footnote from Tradition," by Kenneth Wiggins Porter, *ibid.*
- "An Eighty-niner Who Pioneered the Cherokee Strip," by Lew F. Carroll, *ibid.*

#### DOCUMENTS AND COMPILATIONS ON THE STATES OF THE UPPER SOUTH

- "Thomas Jefferson in Annapolis, November 25, 1783-May 11, 1784," edited by Edith Rossiter Bevan, in the *Maryland Historical Magazine* (June).
- "Copies of Extant Wills from Counties Whose Records Have Been Destroyed," continued, compiled by George H. S. King, in *Tyler's Quarterly Historical and Genealogical Magazine* (April).
- "West Virginians in the American Revolution," continued, edited by Ross B. Johnston, in *West Virginia History* (April).
- "Alfred Mordecai's Notes on Mexico, 1866," edited by James A. Padgett, in the *North Carolina Historical Review* (April).

- "North Carolina Bibliography, 1944-1945," compiled by Mary Lindsay Thornton, *ibid.*
- "Letters of a Confederate Surgeon in the Army of Tennessee to his Wife," continued, edited by Enoch L. Mitchell, in the *Tennessee Historical Quarterly* (June).
- "Ceiling Prices in Tennessee in 1820," edited by Stanley F. Horn, *ibid.*
- "Record of Commissions of Officers in the Tennessee Militia, 1811," continued, compiled by Mrs. John Trotwood Moore, *ibid.*
- "Sketch of the Life of Michael Shuck; Written by Himself in 1875," edited by Orval W. Baylor, in the *Register of the Kentucky State Historical Society* (April).
- "The Civil War Diary of John T. Buegel, Union Soldier," translated by William G. Bek, in the *Missouri Historical Review* (April).
- "The Missouri Reader: The French in the Valley," continued, edited by Dorothy Penn, *ibid.*

## ARTICLES ON THE STATES OF THE LOWER SOUTH

- "South Carolina Poll Tax, 1737-1895," by Herbert Aptheker, in the *Journal of Negro History* (April).
- "Politics of the Hills," by H. Clarence Nixon, in the *Journal of Politics* (May).
- "Rebecca Latimer Felton, Champion of Women's Rights," by Josephine Bone Floyd, in the *Georgia Historical Quarterly* (June).
- "Ambrose Baber at the Court of Sardinia (1841-1843)," by Howard R. Mar-raro, *ibid.*
- "Wanderings of a Painting: The Alonzo Church Portrait," by E. Merton Coul-ter, *ibid.*
- "The Port of St. Augustine during the British Regime," by Wilbur H. Siebert, in the *Florida Historical Quarterly* (April).
- "Physicians and Medicine in Early Jacksonville," by Webster Merritt, *ibid.*
- "Pioneer Florida: Destruction of Port Leon, 1843; First Militia Organization; The Wild Tallahassee of 1827," by T. Frederick Davis, *ibid.*
- "The Contest for Pensacola Bay and Other Gulf Ports, 1698-1722," continued, by Stanley Faye, *ibid.*
- "John Caesar: Seminole Negro Partisan," by Kenneth Wiggins Porter, in the *Journal of Negro History* (April).
- "James William Bates of Batesville," by Evelyn Hammett, in the *Journal of Mississippi History* (January).
- "The Textile Industry in Columbia County, Arkansas," by Glenn G. Martel, in the *Arkansas Historical Quarterly* (Spring).
- "The Arkansas Criminal Law Reform Movement in 1934-36," by Robert A. Leflar, *ibid.*
- "Little Rock and the City Manager Plan," by Henry M. Alexander, *ibid.*
- "The Rice Industry in Arkansas," by Florence L. Rosencrantz, *ibid.* (Summer).

- "Two Pioneer Doctors of Southeast Arkansas: John Wilson Martin and Charles Nicklin Martin," by Elizabeth M. Meek, *ibid.*
- "Some Highlights in the History of Winfield Memorial Methodist Church, Little Rock, Arkansas," by Minnie Ann Buzbee, *ibid.*
- "Early Baptist Movements in Northeast Arkansas," by W. E. McLeod, *ibid.*
- "Another Early Traveler in Arkansas," by Julia R. Vaulx, *ibid.*
- "Historical Sketch Relating to Establishment of State Line between Arkansas and Texas and Relating to the Creation of the Old and New Miller County, Arkansas," by W. H. Arnold, St., *ibid.*
- "La Salle in Texas," by E. W. Cole, in the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* (April).
- "The Life and Times of Minera, Texas," by Janet Roy, *ibid.*
- "Land Grants and Other Aids to Texas Railroads," by S. G. Reed, *ibid.*
- "Cunninghame Graham in Texas," by George P. Isbell, *ibid.*
- "The Citizens White Primary of Marion County," by J. A. R. Moseley, *ibid.*
- "The Old Red House at Nacogdoches," by Lois Foster Blount, *ibid.*
- "Notes on Some Workers in Texas Entomology, 1839-1880," by S. W. Geiser, *ibid.*
- "The Early German Contribution to Music in Texas," by Lota M. Spell, in the *American-German Review* (April).
- "Political Occurrences on the Island of Galvezton in 1818" [written by George Mason Graham in 1887], contributed by George Mason Graham Stafford, in *Tyler's Quarterly Historical and Genealogical Magazine* (April).

#### DOCUMENTS AND COMPILATIONS ON THE STATES OF THE LOWER SOUTH

- "Pendleton in the Eighteen Thirties; Selections from the Langdon Cheves Papers," edited by Samuel G. Stoney, in the *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine* (April).
- "Shipbuilding on St. Helena Island in 1816; A Diary of Ebenezer Coffin," contributed by J. Harold Easterby, *ibid.*
- "Marriage and Death Notices from the City Gazette of Charleston, S. C.," continued, contributed by Elizabeth H. Jervey, *ibid.*
- "The Memoirs of Frederick Adolphus Porcher," continued, edited by Samuel Gaillard Stoney, *ibid.*
- "Journal of General Peter Horry," continued, *ibid.*
- "Marriage and Death Notices from the Pendleton Messenger of Pendleton, S. C.," continued, contributed by J. M. Lesesne, *ibid.*
- "Commission and Instructions of Governor John Reynolds, August 6, 1754," edited by Albert B. Saye, in the *Georgia Historical Quarterly* (June).
- "A Bibliography of Irwin Russell, with a Biographical Sketch," by Laura D. S. Harrell, in the *Journal of Mississippi History* (January).
- "The Oxford Hospital, 1862," edited by Willie D. Halsell, *ibid.*

- "Friedrich Gerstaecker in Arkansas," translated by Clarence Evans and Liselotte Albrecht, in the *Arkansas Historical Quarterly* (Spring).
- "Hanging Judge Parker: The Man, Not the Legend," edited by Fred Harvey Harrington, *ibid.*
- "A True Copy of Agreement and Subscription of the Sulphur Rock Male and Female Academy," edited by Edgar Holcombe, *ibid.*
- "Check List of Texas Imprints, 1846-1876," continued, edited by Ernest W. Winkler, in the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* (April).
- "Dr. John Sibley and the Louisiana-Texas Frontier, 1803-1814," concluded, edited by Julia Kathryn Garrett, *ibid.*

## GENERAL AND REGIONAL ARTICLES, DOCUMENTS, AND COMPILATIONS

- "The Jolliet Lost Map of the Mississippi," by Jean Delanglez, in *Mid-America* (April).
- "Colonial Fellows of the Royal Society of London, 1661-1788," by Raymond Phineas Stearns, in the *William and Mary Quarterly* (April).
- "The Lexington Alarm, April 19, 1775," by Elizabeth Merritt, in the *Maryland Historical Magazine* (June).
- "The Death of Washington," by William Buckner McGroarty, in the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* (April).
- "Madison's Defense of Freneau," by Philip Marsh, in the *William and Mary Quarterly* (April).
- "The One-Party Period of American History," by Charles S. Sydnor, in the *American Historical Review* (April).
- "Zachary Taylor on Jackson and the Military Establishment, 1835," edited by William D. Hoyt, Jr., *ibid.*
- "How Ben Butler Saved 'Old Ironsides,'" by Louis Taylor Merrill, in the *Maryland Historical Magazine* (June).
- "Confederate Plans for Procuring Subsistence Stores," by Frank E. Vandiver, in *Tyler's Quarterly Historical and Genealogical Magazine* (April).
- "General Ewell to the High Private in the Rear," contributed by T. Harry Williams, in the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* (April).
- "The Submarine in the Revolution and Civil War," by Edwin C. Mustard, in *Social Studies* (May).
- "New Approach to Teaching the Civil War," by John B. Learson, *ibid.*
- "Legislative Control of the Southern Free Negro, 1861-1865," by Bernard H. Nelson, in the *Catholic Historical Review* (April).
- "The Struggle of the Negro in Ohio for Freedom," by J. Reuben Sheeler, in the *Journal of Negro History* (April).
- "Economic Democracy in the Slave South: An Appraisal of Some Recent Views," by Fabian Linden, *ibid.*
- "The Progressive Movement in the South, 1870-1914," by Arthur S. Link, in the *North Carolina Historical Review* (April).

## CONTRIBUTORS

WENDELL H. STEPHENSON is professor of history at the University of Kentucky.

LOUIS MORTON was a research associate for Colonial Williamsburg before entering the Army in 1943. He is now with the Historical Division of the War Department Special Staff, in Washington, D. C.

ALLEN J. GOING is instructor in history at the University of Alabama and is a candidate for the doctorate at the University of North Carolina.

HERBERT COLLINS is tutor in history at Brooklyn College and a candidate for the doctorate at Columbia University.

SAMUEL C. McCULLOCH, formerly assistant professor of history at Amherst College, will become visiting assistant professor of history at the University of Michigan at the beginning of the fall term.

RICHARD BEALE DAVIS is professor of English at the University of South Carolina.

# THE HISPANIC AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW

*A quarterly circulated widely in Latin America and the  
United States containing articles, inedited documents,  
book reviews, minor notices, and professional news.*

MANAGING EDITOR: JAMES FERGUSON KING

## BOARD OF EDITORS

Arthur S. Aiton  
Carlos E. Castañeda  
Charles C. Griffin  
Lewis Hanke  
Roscoe R. Hill

Roland D. Hussey  
James F. King  
Irving A. Leonard  
Alexander Marchant

## ADVISORY EDITORS

Herbert E. Bolton  
Isaac J. Cox  
Clarence H. Haring

Dana G. Munro  
J. Fred Rippy  
William S. Robertson

*Editorial correspondence:* PROFESSOR JAMES F. KING  
ROOM 439, BANCROFT LIBRARY  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA  
BERKELEY 4, CALIFORNIA

*Business correspondence:* DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS  
COLLEGE STATION  
DURHAM, N. C.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: \$4.00 A YEAR  
SPECIAL RATES TO GRADUATE STUDENTS

# VIRGINIA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Organized 1831 — Chartered 1834

ALEXANDER W. WEDDELL, PRESIDENT

Publishers of the

## VIRGINIA MAGAZINE OF HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY

The April, 1946, issue contains the following:

*Views of Yorktown and Gloucester Town, 1755* by Earl G. Swem.

*The Papers of Richard Evelyn Byrd I, of Frederick County, Virginia,*  
by Everard Kidder Meade.

*Journey to the Springs, 1846,* by William D. Hoyt, Jr.

*The Colonial Churches of Northumberland and Lancaster Counties,*  
*Virginia,* by George Carrington Mason.

*The Death of Washington,* by William Buckner McGroarty.

*General Ewell to the High Private in the Rear,* by T. Harry Williams.

Book Reviews

Genealogies

Notes

MEMBERSHIPS: Life, \$100.00; Annual Sustaining, \$50.00;  
Annual Supporting, \$25.00; Annual, \$5.00

Magazine sent without additional charge to members

The Lee House, 707 East Franklin St.  
RICHMOND 19, VIRGINIA

Editor and Corresponding Sec'y.  
CLAYTON TORRENCE

# The Pacific Historical Review

*Issued by the*  
Pacific Coast Branch  
*of the*

American Historical Association

Articles, documents, book reviews, comments  
and historical news on the entire Pacific area

## BOARD OF EDITORS

Managing Editor: LOUIS KNOTT KOONTZ

Book Review Editor: JOHN W. CAUGHEY

DAN E. CLARK

FRANCIS H. HERRICK

PETER M. DUNNE, S.J.

MERRILL M. JENSEN

WILLIAM H. ELLISON

W. KAYE LAMB

MAX SAVELLE

Published in March, June, September, and December

Subscription rates: \$4.00 a year;

Canada, \$4.25; other countries, \$4.50

SPECIAL RATES TO STUDENTS

*A sample copy will be sent on request*

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS

BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

# The William and Mary Quarterly

A journal designed to promote interest in the history  
of Colonial America and of the formative  
era of the Republic.

The William and Mary Quarterly is published by  
The Institute of Early American History and Culture.

(Sponsored by The College of William and Mary,  
and Colonial Williamsburg, Inc.)

## Board of Editors

THOMAS P. ABERNETHY

DOUGLAS SOUTHALL FREEMAN

RANDOLPH G. ADAMS

SAMUEL ELIOT MORISON

CARL BRIDENBAUGH

STANLEY PARGELLIS

Managing Editor, RICHARD L. MORTON

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: \$3.00

SINGLE COPIES: \$1.00

Correspondence should be addressed to

The Managing Editor, Goodwin Building, Williamsburg, Virginia



# AGRICULTURAL HISTORY

Designed as a medium for the publication of research and documents pertaining to the history of agriculture in all its phases and as a clearing house for information of interest and value to workers in the field. Materials on the history of agriculture in all countries are included and also material on institutions, organizations, and sciences which have been factors in agricultural development.

ISSUED QUARTERLY SINCE 1927

BY

THE AGRICULTURAL HISTORY SOCIETY

Subscriptions, including membership: Regular, \$3.00; Student, \$1.50;  
Contributing, \$10.00; Life, a sum in dollars equal to 100 less  
age of applicant.

*Editor:*  
EVERETT E. EDWARDS

*Secretary-Treasurer:*  
ARTHUR G. PETERSON

ROOM 3901, SOUTH BUILDING, 13TH AND C STREETS SW  
WASHINGTON, D. C.

## *Complete back files of* **THE JOURNAL OF SOUTHERN HISTORY**

Including title page and index for each volume  
may be obtained at \$3.00 per volume

*Single numbers can be supplied at 75 cents each*

SEND ORDERS TO

JAMES W. PATTON, *Secretary-Treasurer*

NORTH CAROLINA STATE COLLEGE    RALEIGH, NORTH CAROLINA



## THE TEXAS STATE HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

1897—*The Oldest Learned Society in Texas*—1897

### *Offers in* THE SOUTHWESTERN HISTORICAL QUARTERLY

Articles, documents, comments, news notes, and book reviews  
dealing with Texas and the Southwest

*Managing Editor*

WALTER PRESCOTT WEBB

*Associate Editors*

CHARLES W. HACKETT

RUDOLPH L. BIESELE

H. BAILEY CARROLL

Subscription rate: \$3.00 per year

Correspondence relating to contributions and subscriptions should be  
addressed to the Managing Editor, University Station, Austin, Texas.

---

The Association also publishes

## THE JUNIOR HISTORIAN

A literary and historical magazine by and for young people of  
Junior High, Senior High, and Lower College levels. The first  
magazine in America for young people also written almost  
exclusively by them.

*Editor*

H. BAILEY CARROLL

Subscription rate: \$1.00 per school year.

Correspondence relating to *The Junior Historian* should be  
addressed to the Editor, University Station, Austin, Texas.

---

---

# THE SOUTHERN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

●

## PRESIDENT

ELLA LONN, Goucher College

## VICE-PRESIDENT

THOMAS D. CLARK, University of Kentucky

## SECRETARY-TREASURER

JAMES W. PATTON, North Carolina State College

## EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

(In addition to the officers named above)

## EX-PRESIDENTS

(For three years following expiration of their terms)

J. G. DE ROULHAC HAMILTON, University of North Carolina (1946)

WENDELL H. STEPHENSON, University of Kentucky (1947)

FLETCHER M. GREEN, University of North Carolina (1948)

## MANAGING EDITOR

WILLIAM C. BINKLEY, Vanderbilt University

## ELECTED MEMBERS

LYNN M. CASE, Louisiana State University (1946)

RALPH B. FLANDERS, New York University (1946)

J. WINSTON COLEMAN, JR., Lexington, Kentucky (1947)

HENRY T. SHANKS, Birmingham-Southern College (1947)

J. HAROLD EASTERBY, College of Charleston (1948)

DANIEL M. ROBISON, Vanderbilt University (1948)

---

---